

N. English

DEFENCE
OF THE
RIGHT REVEREND
THE
Lord Bishop of SARUM.
IN
ANSWER
To a BOOK, Entituled,
A Prefatory Discourse
TO
An EXAMINATION of the
BISHOP of SARUM'S
EXPOSITION
OF THE
XXXIX Articles of the Church of England, &c.

*699 87
3*

L O N D O N,

Printed, and to be Sold by *A. Baldwin*, near the Oxford-
Arms in Warwick-Lane. M DCC III.

DEPT. OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

THE PREFACE.

THE READER may perhaps wonder that, so long after the Publication of a Book, there should come out an Answer to it. The true Reason of it, is, That I had not seen the Book, till a good while after 'twas Publish'd ; and when I had, I thought that either the Bishop would Answer it, or that it was his Opinion it did not deserve an Answer ; And I found nothing in it that could work upon a Considering Man.

But when the Design seem'd to be prosecuted, and particular Articles came to be examin'd, and the same was threaten'd to the rest ; and the Bishop's Answer was ridicul'd, and Himself call'd The great Master of Compendious Answering (by One who is a greater, and who has given more Compendious Answers himself to Books written against him, even none at all) I began to think, that the Cry might make an Impression upon those, who did not read, but only heard the Noise ; and the Silence on this Side be imputed a Confession by many of those also that did.

Nor was I much displeas'd at having such Pleas, for entring against this Treatise, offer'd me. For its Artful, Cunning, Studied Way to Deceive, and Impose upon the Reader, and its Groundless, Uncharitable, Undeserved Treatment of the Bishop, had provok'd me ; my Respect to the Bishop's Station, and Character, had invited me ; and the Easiness of the Matter had encourag'd me : and so I was, without any great difficulty, determin'd to give the Book this Answer.

And this I was the more ready to do, because I was willing to shew what Terms of Communion some Men lay upon us, more than the Church does ; and that Those, who have the Opprobrious Mark of Moderate Men set upon them, hold all that the Church requires ; and therefore ought not to be robb'd of the Title of Her True Sons, any more than they rob the others, whom they blame not for holding more

THE PREFACE.

than the Church requires, but for imposing it. That there are such Men as lay such Weights upon us, and that All who approve The Prefatory Discourse are such, I have, I hope, in some measure made out; and, I doubt not, shall feel. For, I make no question, I shall be counted No Church-man, for daring to undertake the Defence of a Man, whom 'tis the Mark of a Party to Vilifie, and Disrespect; and the Confutation of a Book, that they Cry up, and Admire.

This is all the Account I have to give of the following Answer. Such as it is, I commit it to the Candid and Impartial Readers, if there be any such. From such as are Sworn to a Party, against that WORTHY MAN I Defend, I neither desire Favour, nor expect Justice.

Because I have often had Occasion to mention the Declaration of King Charles the First, in treating of the Sense in which the Articles are to be submitted to; which Declaration, the King tells us, was made with the Advice of so many of the Bishops, as might conveniently be Called together; and because it is very much to our present Purpose, I have therefore thought it proper to lay Part of it before the Reader. “ That therefore in these, both Curious, and Unhappy “ Differences, which have for so many Hundred Years, in different “ Times and Places, exercis'd the Church of Christ; We Will, “ That all further Curious Search be laid aside, and these Disputes “ shut up in God's Promises, as they be generally set forth to Us “ in the Holy Scriptures, and the GENERAL MEANING of “ the Articles of the Church of England according to them. And “ that no Man hereafter shall either Print, or Preach, to draw the “ Article aside any way, but shall submit to it, in the plain and “ full Meaning thereof: and shall not put his own Sense, or Comment, to be the Meaning of the Article, but shall take it in “ the Literal, and GRAMMATICAL SENSE.

From hence let any One judge, with what Justice the Bishop of Sarum is accus'd, either of Novelty; or of any such Latitudinarian Design, as may prejudice the Church of England.

A N

A N
A N S W E R

T O T H E
Prefatory Discourse, &c.

S I R,

PERMIT me, after the Freedom that you have taken in handling the *Bishop of Sarum* in the manner you have, to be only so free with you, though unknown, as to address my self to you, in the Defence of a Work which is as much above your Censure as its Author is above Regarding it. 'Tis not worth His While, to leave his more Important Business, to take Notice of every one who unjustly and maliciously makes it his to Revile and Abuse Him, either because he cannot or will not understand him. But I, having a little Leisure, thought it would not be thrown away, if I took some Pains in fairly representing His Lordship's Notions, in clearing them from your foul Insinuations, and weak Objections; and letting the World see, that you want a better Cause, or your Cause a better Advocate. This I could have done in a shorter and clearer Method, and easier to my self, than I have now chosen; but I knew what sort of a Man I had to deal with, and therefore I resolved to trace you through every Paragraph, to show there was not a Syllable in you I was afraid of, and to take away all occasion of Pretence from you, that I had pass'd by any thing Material: And Pardon me, if I sometimes express a Resentment for your treating the Bishop with so *unusual* an Insolence.

You begin with that, which, in the small Knowledge I have had, is notoriously False: The Book indeed has been *the general Topick of Discourse*, but with quite another Character than you mention. For those that I have heard speak of it, and enquir'd about it from, have given it a Name as if they thought it Useful, and as Exact as a Book of that Nature could be. It was Sold and Praised at no ordinary Rate, and Recommended to the Clergy by no ordinary Men. But you might not perhaps know this. Men's Conversations lie different ways, and we don't care for, or mind, and so don't remember what those talk, who are not of the Opinion we have any ways pleas'd to take up.

B

But

But in the next four Paragraphs it must be compared, to make it look odious, and the *Bishop* be thought a Changeling, to the *Naked Truth*; a Book design'd for a *Comprehension*, and which Doctor *Burnet* Answer'd. That Book, it seems, though written with a great deal of *Art and Cunning*, fit to deceive Unwary People, would not take in that Reign. But when the Revolution happen'd, we expected mighty Changes, and the Book was new Publish'd, and Seconded with some more of the same sort. But all the Mischief could, for all this, be done the Church, was gaining a *Toleration*. When such open Dealings would not turn to good Account, the *Latitudinarians*, who had lain still a while meditating upon *Ruine and Comprehension*, at last broke the Peace, with a Contrivance that brought along with it sad *Alarms and Jealousies* to all honest Men, of effecting their wicked Designs, under a shew of Service; doing by the Church, as you do by the *Bishop*, in the next Sentence, give him a Good-word or two in the first part of it, only to make the Reflexion, in the second part of it, fall the heavier. And who should be at the head of this but the Bishop of *Sarum*, who has, for all his understanding the World so well, made so odd a turn in it, as to be of different Minds in different Reigns, and to promote a Design now, which he before oppos'd? And to make this the more odd; When he was a *Stranger*, a *Neuter*, nothing almost amongst us, he was so kind to the Church, as to write for *Episcopacy*: But now he is a *Bishop himself*, in one of the most Eminent Stations of the *Hierarchy*, he is grown cold and indifferent, no great Friend to himself or his Order, but would be glad to Encourage all Parties whatever, and have Things reduc'd to the comfortable Equality of a Neighbour-Nation. Seriously, this is, as you say, so unaccountable, that no Considering Man can believe it; and your hearty Ill-will quite blinded you, when it caus'd you to load the Case with so many Aggravations as made it absurd. We know by their Practice, that Men, out of Interest or Spite, will throw up their Principles, or desert them: But for a Man to relinquish his Principles and his Interest both at once, and have the satisfaction of wrecking his Malice only upon himself; What think you of it? Were this Relation true, and the Designs directly opposite to one another, all that could be said would be, that the *Bishop* was grown either Better or Worse than in a former Reign. If Better; every one who thinks so, would allow the Change to be Commendable, and wish it in every Body: If Worse; it would be for their Interest who judge it so, to allow it at least Pardonable, for fear they shou'd be without Excuse, when they are found to have done so. But if all this be False; If there be no such thing as you lay to his Charge; If my Lord of *Sarum*, in Expounding the Articles of the Church of England in such manner as he has done, hath not drawn a Scheme for Latitude in Opinion, any farther than the Articles themselves allow; If his Account of the Articles themselves, and the Manner of Subscribing them, be not particularly New, but such as becomes a Faithful Expositor and an Honest Man, and lets in none but such as the Church did not design to provide a Barrier against: Then you must allow your self to be an Unfair Stater of the Case; and must not take it ill, if he who believes so, Gain-say or Refute you.

In the next Paragraph, you are in a maze to see so many Great Names fix'd before, and so many Years spent upon a Book, which, when it Comes out, only makes

makes honest Men look back, and suspect their *First Principles in Divinity and Morality*. You cannot, for your heart, out of your Singular Respect to the *Bishop*, with which all your Expressions are even surfeited, believe your Eyes. Though, let me tell you, There are some Things in a Set of Writings, that would sooner make a Man distrust his Senses, considering the great Deference the English Clergy are upon all Occasions known to pay their *Metropolitans and Bishops*. Considering this, 'twould make a Man stare, to see One of the *Bishop's* Station, and Character, and Merits, every where made Mean, and Despicable, and Wicked, and never allow'd a Civil Word, but when 'tis to make another Word more Uncivil; to see a *Bishop* almost in plain Terms call'd the *Subverter of the Church*, the *Encourager of the Enemies* of it, an *unsincere Prevaricator*, and in this very Paragraph, in effect, an ignorant Knave; who can't tell the common receiv'd Sense of the *Articles*, and the Duty a of Subscriber, and makes Subscriptions, Declarations and Oaths of so little use, as to be no Security to those that impose them: Such things, I say, would make a Man stare, considering the great Deference of the Clergy of that Church, of which you write your self a *Presbyter*. It looks as if you and your Friends made a Jest of this Deference, notwithstanding all your Obligations to it, when you scarce ever use such Expressions, but in Sentences so void of the thing, that it looks ridiculous to see them so match'd, and is no better than the *King's Authority* in a *Parliament Declaration*. You'd do well to consider what Respect to *Bishops*, and Truth are, and act hereafter as if you thought them things for which you are one day to be Answerable.

That the *Bishop* has publish'd a Reverse to the usual Notion of Subscribing, *ex animo*, is glaringly False, to any one that looks but into his Introduction: That he has put new Constructions upon several of the *Articles*, I hope will be so presently. If there were the least Reason to think he had, every honest Man would rejoyce that the *Convocation* had Gensured him, though at the Time and in the Manner they did. For their private Animosities, let them see to't; They are to Answer for it. Decency and Regularity are such desirable and lovely things, that, if they be not observ'd, no honest Church of England Man will complain of the want of frequent *Convocations*. What they meant, who wrote and talk'd for the Rights of the *Lower House*, whether 'twere that they might not be interrupted in what they were doing for the Service of the Church, or for some other by-End, the World will judge, now the Dispute is publish'd. The Dispute, I'm sure, did nothing towards that Service. An Exposition of the *Articles*, is, no doubt, of great Concern to the Church, and as it is now perform'd, of as great Advantage. And, lastly, I can fairly acknowledge, That to deliver a Sense which varies from the Doctrine of the Church, is worse than framing a New Article, because it's contradicting the true one: And could I in my Conscience be perswaded that the *Bishop* had done so, I would be as Opposite, though not as Rude to him, as any one.

Could there any thing be shown, in the *Exposition*, against the *Establish'd Religion*, or the Foundation it stands upon, (the Zeal for which made the *House*

with so much Caution, Good Manners, and Decency, take the first opportunity of acting according to their indispensable Obligation) those, that are not now of the same Opinion with them, would think themselves under the same indispensable Obligation of resting in their Decision, and thanking them for rescuing the Articles from Glosses inconsistent with, or in any degree repugnant to the Sense of the Church; and of praising their Courage, in defending them against a Member of the Upper House, as well as their Watchfulness in such Important Matters which naturally fall within their Cognizance. But it must be confess'd, after all, that some having fairly and impartially consider'd the Case, cannot induce themselves to think that what they complain'd of did deserve any such Terms at their Hands; leaving them and the Bishop of Hereford to dispute about the Duty, and Humility, and Sincerity, the Complaint was presented with.

However, Presented it was, drawn up in Three Heads: And they who were immediately engag'd in Drawing it up, you say, now count themselves oblig'd to satisfy the World and His Lordship, if possible, that the Charge is Just; and in the next Paragraph, you hope that My Lord's Christian Humility and Patience (which become a Bishop just as much as some other Vertues would become a Presbyter) will get so much the upper-hand of his Humane Frailty, as to make him not take it ill to have such a Body Vindicate their Judgment against him. The Request is so Just, that His Lordship, I dare say, is not against it, if we may take his Word, which he has not yet forfeited, That he will be Thankful to have any Faults show'd him: especially sure by so great a Body of Men, in Defence of (the Church and) their own Opinion. But, for all this, whether they be the Work of the Body, or have had their Review and Approbation, or be only the Confidence of a private Member, we don't know. I am apt to think indeed, some of these Reasons might be those that brought on that Censure, and that there are no better for it: but I can't persuade my self, that a whole Body of Men would use such rude Irreverences, as this Book is fraught with, to a Bishop. He may possibly have err'd, and so may They, considering Humane Frailty, and 'tis no fault to tell either of them so respectfully: But Incivility, I think, can as little escape so grave a Body, as it can become a single Presbyter.

To point out all the obnoxious Passages and Suggestions under every Article, would require a Volume as big as the Exposition it self: but this which you have done, will serve to justify the Conduct of the House. After the rate indeed of your Writing, which is half Repetition and Insinuation, it might swell to a pretty big Volume; enlarging too upon every Fault, (and enlarge you must a good while, before you can make it look like one) which a quick-sighted Malice can think it has found, or, contrary to its thoughts, make. But really you might write a Book of such Faults as you have found just as big as the Exposition, even the Exposition it self; there being nothing in it but what's as blameable as most, I may say, all of those Mistakes you have pitch'd upon.

But this Paragraph was only meant; I suppose, to blacken the Cause, and not for solid Truth. And so too the whole Introduction is nothing but a Flourish; which I have not given a full and particular Answer to, in all its Parts, because we shall have them over and over again, this being only Opening the Case. And I dare say, no Cause in *Chancery* was ever Open'd with more Insinuations and Blackening, and less Charity and Truth. Because it wants this last Vertue 'tis, that it stands in need of those other Qualities; and if it did not need them, no one would be so injurious to it, as to make it look, by the Use of them, as if it did. It is a shrewd sign Men suspect their own Strength, when they use such Arts. Nor is it Just to the Reader, to use any Tricks to Prejudice and put a Byass upon his Judgment: But he fairly ought to Determine for himself upon the Reasons offer'd, and yield to those whose Arguments, and not whose Foreheads are hardest. I will speak as plainly therefore to the Matter in hand, as your flying from it into Generals, and talk of the Church, and Insinuations scattered every where among your Reasons, and your loose Style, and my own Abileries will give me leave; and shall, I hope, however I am upon these Accounts sometimes forc'd out the Road, keep within the Bounds of Decency and Charity, from which you have shamefully wander'd, under greater Obligations and lesser Temptations than I have.

We come now to the Matter in hand: And the First Head of Complaint is, *That the Exposition tends to introduce such a Latitude in Opinion, as the Articles were fram'd to avoid.* And a strange Exposition that must be, and the Author of it none of the honestest Men, whose very Design is contrary to the Design of that whereof it is the Exposition. To make this out, you, 1st. Consider the Design of the Church in framing the Articles; and herein you, for the most part, say nothing but what may be fairly allow'd: And therefore when you come, 2^{dly}. To prove the Scope and Design of the Exposition to be inconsistent with that of the Articles; either you do not prove it to be so, or else you prove that the Bishop is inconsistent with himself: for he certainly contends for no more Latitude than you allow in the Articles.

The Articles might be framed for many good Ends and Purposes; but the only thing mention'd in the Title, is to avoid Diversities of Opinions, and to establish Consent, touching True Religion. 'Twas more for the Benefit of Unity, and Peace at Home, than the Satisfaction of other Reformed Churches Abroad, that they were made. Something of that there might be, because the Church desir'd to hold a good Correspondence with them; but the chief Design was Unanimity at Home, not only in all Fundamentals and known Articles of Faith, but in necessary Doctrines with respect to the Discipline of the Society. This is all true: And from hence it will follow, that whenever they had secur'd the Discipline, and those Fundamentals, the thing they aim'd at was done; and they did not design to exclude any that differ'd not in the Fundamental, but only in Points not necessary; or to abuse the Churches abroad, which there was no reason the Subscribers to our Articles should be oblig'd to condemn, so they acknowledg'd Ours to be

be good. This you must allow : For acknowledging Our Discipline to be Good, is sufficient to make them maintain *Peace and Unanimity at Home*, which you know is *the chief Design of the Articles* : and thinking that settled Abroad to be so too, does not all destroy it ; and therefore could not be intended to be Condemn'd by Our Church, which, *next to Unanimity at Home*, desires to hold good Correspondence with those Abroad. The Church took care to Exclude such as differ'd in Points affecting the Purity of Faith, or its own necessary Discipline, not such as might have Notions (perhaps not true, but yet) not prejudicial to either of them. The *Articles* have confirm'd Our Constitution, but not affronted Others. And this is all the *Bishop* says in the Place which you have fairly left us to guess that you refer to. He does not in the least imply that their Eye was first upon the Churches Abroad, but only that the *Article* was so worded, as to allow, or at least not disallow their Ordination to be Lawful. The place is in the XXIII^d *Article*, and the words are ; *This is put in very general Terms, far from that Magisterial Stiffness in which some have taken upon them to dictate in that Matter : The Article does not resolve this into any particular Constitution, but leaves the Matter open and at large for such Accidents as had happen'd, and might still happen. They who drew it, had the State of the Churches before their Eyes that had differently Reform'd, &c.* We shall have occasion to talk of this Passage by and by : Let but any one for the present read the *Article*, and see whether it is not left so general ; and do you consider whether *having the State of the Churches before their Eyes*, amounts to any more than desiring to hold a good Correspondence with them ; and whether 'twould have been reasonable, or becoming those who desir'd to hold such a good Correspondence, to Exclude all that thought the Orders were Valid in Other Churches, when they thought Ours not only so, but upon a better Foot, and less out of the settled Way, as the *Bishop* says ; and so could by their Opinion do us no Damage.

The most effectual way of accomplishing this their Design of Unanimity, is, to take care that the Teachers be agreed : and therefore all that look towards the Ministry, are generally train'd up in the same Notions of Things ; and before they are admitted into the Ministry, are to Subscribe the Articles ; in which also they are Examin'd, to show that they understand them aright, and can prove them from Scripture. I shall not take notice of the two pretty Designs in this Paragraph ; the one of a blind Education, to prejudice those that are bred up Scholars, to an Implicit Belief of all the Things contain'd in the *Articles*, and of the Proofs their Teachers shall be pleas'd, or able to give them of them ; the other, of making it necessary for them to Believe the *Articles*, in the same Sense that the Examiner does ; nor tell you how Popishly they look, and what Handle they give to Men of freer Thoughts to ridicule our Church : but shall only say, That as to the main Design of this Paragraph, the *Bishop* will agree with you : 'Tis his Opinion, that every Man ought to Subscribe the *Articles*, *ex animo* ; and then I dare answer for his Honesty so far, that he would not have any Man Teach or Act contrary to his Subscription, because 'twould

'twould be Acting contrary to his Conscience. And obliging Men to this, he allows them in no material Difference: And if you'll show me where he once leaves Room for any Two to Subscribe that differ in any Material Point, I'll give up the Cause. *Material*, I say; and you your self use the word, because you can't but be sensible, that the *Articles* have not provided against Difference in Opinions *not material*, but by general and indetermin'd Expressions have purposely left room for those that so Differ, to Subscribe, as we shall find you too bountifully allow for Ten *Articles* together.

Thus both-Clergy and Laity are taken Care of: But of the Clergy such particular Care is taken, that one would not think it possible, that the Obligation they lie under to be of one Mind, as to whatever is determin'd in the Articles, should ever come to be disputed. I don't know any one that disputes it, as to *whatever is determin'd in the Articles*, except those that take them for Articles of Union; who, I believe, could say so much for their Opinion, that, with their *Persons*, you would have accepted it. But the *Bishop of Sarum* has the ill luck, not to be in your favour; and therefore you'll insinuate, that he disputes their *Obligation*, when you know he proves it in the 7th and 8th Pages, as fully as can be.

The Civil Power does sometimes allow Latitude to take in different Parties. I doubt, 'twas not the Latitude of the Oath, but of Men's Consciences, that let them in to the Government which they were no hearty Friends to. I can't see what Interest the Government can have in such a Latitude, except it be letting its Enemies into its very Bowels. However, I won't dispute it, because I won't disturb you; but leave you as easie as you thought your self under this Subterfuge. *But this is not proper in Matters of Religion; and its a great Mistake, that our Church intended any such Double-meaning.* If the Articles had been made to take in different Parties, they might have been call'd Articles of Union: but the Title says, they are to avoid Diversity of Opinions; and therefore they cannot be thought to encourage them, and allow Men to be of different Minds, as to the very Things wherein it was propos'd they should Agree: and for this, you bid us but look upon the Title. I have look'd upon't, and think you fight with your own Shadow. The *Articles* were certainly made, to take in so many of different Parties, as differ not in any material thing, touching true Religion: and the Church so much loves Number, as not to exclude any honest Man whose Opinions differ from another's in less important Matters, that concern not the Purity of Faith. It took care to shut out only those that differ'd in such important Points as concern'd Pure Doctrine, and Necessary Discipline; not others: So that you say true, at last, *The Articles were not intended to admit those who are of different Opinions, as to the very Points in which it was propos'd they should agree.* But in those things wherein it was not so propos'd, they may still differ; and in all Points not material, it was not: though in fixing the material ones, they are forc'd to touch upon such Points; but they always do it in a manner that shows there was Care us'd not to determine them. Before I leave this Paragraph, I cannot but take notice of
your

your Christian Hint, That the *Bishop* takes them for *Articles of Union* : Which is false. And its being so, plainly shows, he had no design of introducing such a Latitude as is contrary to theirs. Had he been so minded, his way would have been to have made the best of that Opinion, and of the Authorities that give credit to it. There are many true Church of *England* Men of that Opinion ; Men to your own Mind. That there have been such, you know ; and therefore, as I believe you would excuse that Opinion in those that did hold it, so I would not have you lay it as a fault to those that do not.

Well: *The Design of the Church, by the Title, is declar'd to be, That such as Subscribe the Articles, should Agree to the Things therein contain'd. There may happen to be Obscurity and Ambiguity in Expressions ; but it could not but be the Design of the Church to avoid it, when it declares its Design was to avoid Diversities of Opinions. If there be a Scope for Diversity of Opinions, it is but by Accidents, and the Design of the Church must have been contrary. The Title declares the Design of the Articles to be, to avoid Diversity of Opinions in Matters touching True Religion : And the Scope for which the Bishop contends, is in Matters not affecting that. The Church shows, it did not intend to avoid what you falsely call Obscurity or Ambiguity. A word's obscure and ambiguous, when we either don't understand the word, or else don't know which of its Senses it is to be taken in. But when we plainly understand the word, and see that any of its Senses can agree with the connexion of the Discourse, we may fairly suppose, that Any of them equally express the Speaker's meaning : and then it can't properly be call'd Ambiguous ; because, take it in which sense you will, you hit the meaning of the Speaker ; who, by not restraining it, shows, he did not intend to exclude that. Besides, Obscurity and Ambiguity are not the only ways to leave room for Diversity of Opinions. There are such things as general Words, general Expressions, and Definitions, that will do it effectually. And we are so civil to the Church, as to suppose, that it as much as possible avoided those, and used these ; which, we shall find, it did not by Accident, but Design.*

You go on and say, *That a private Man may be Ambiguous : but when so many Men of known Integrityes and Abilities make it their business to reduce the Doctrine of the Church to Articles, which are to be a Test upon Men, whereby to try whether they are of the same Communion or not, it's not easie to think they fall so short of their Design, as to take little or no hold of the Subscriber. No body supposes, as I know, that they do fall short of it. The words fully express, what they were design'd to express ; and are sufficient to exclude all whom they design to exclude. We can't think that such Men should make things not affecting the Purity of Faith (so the Bishop calls, what the Title to the Articles calls True Religion) a Test whether Men are of the same Communion or no ; and 'tis in those only that we imagine there is what you call an Ambiguity. To turn the Argument upon you : Since so many Men of Honesty, and Integrity, and Masters of Style, have evidently left an open and free Entrance for Men of*

of

of different Opinions in things not affecting the Purity of Faith, and true Religion; Is it not thence plain, that they so intended to do, since with those Qualities it cannot be thought they could fail of their Design? Indeed, it is not to be supposed, that so Wise a Body of Men should have a Design to keep out all who had Thoughts different from their own, in things that don't affect true Religion, or the Quiet of our own Constitution. These only our *Articles* were to secure, and not disturb Men in their Opinions about other things. And we don't think, as you so often insinuate, that they had not *Abilities to express things as they intended*, and in as strict a manner as was sufficient to *establish Consent* in what they intended *Consent should be establish'd*. We don't think them such Fools; but we think not only, that they design'd to leave such a *Latitude*, but also, that they have worded things so generally, as effectually to have accomplish'd that their Design. Since then the Men that compiled them, were Men of *Integrity, and Abilities, and Masters of Style*, it follows, that it's true, what the *Bishop* says, [pag. 9] *Where the Articles are conceiv'd in large and general Words, and have not more special and restrain'd Terms in them, we ought to take that for a sure Indication, that the Church does not intend to tie Men up too severely to particular Opinions, but that she leaves All to such a Liberty as is agreeable with the Purity of Faith.*

The *Articles* have prevented *Disputes*, for these Seven-score Years, about the different Senses the Words may in common and unforc'd Construction be made to bear. They have been look'd upon as the Standard. The different Opinions about *Hell*, have proceeded from the Expression in the Creed, and the others don't at all belong to the *Articles*. This is a pleasant Paragraph. There has been no Dispute about the Sense of the *Articles*, and yet it hath been disputed about the sense of the word *Hell*, which is in the *Articles*, and I suppose means something, that is, has some sense. But those Disputes, it seems, are about *Hell*, in the Creed. Well: and you your self grant, that the very same thing is meant in both; no more, nor no less. If then the word *Hell* be taken, by different Men, in different Senses, in the Creed; Is it not also in the *Article*? And is not the Creed too Subscribed to in the *Articles*, and in the same Sense that the *Articles* themselves are? *Hell* indeed hath nor can have but one real and true Sense, either in the Creed or the *Article*; and so one sort of Men only can be in the right: but neither the *Article* nor the Creed have defin'd which is the right Sense; and consequently, it is not material to True Religion, which of the Common Senses Men take it in. But there's something more. There are likewise some disputed Points wherein Men differ, and each Party brings the *Articles* to favour his Side: but yet that is not owing to Men's taking upon them to put different Senses upon the *Article*. Why? one Party thinks that the *Article* is of his Opinion; and the other, that 'tis of his. Don't they take it then in different Senses? Ay, but neither of them think that it may be taken in Two Senses. That's their want of Charity to those

those that differ from them. But an impartial Man would tell them, that the *Article* would bear either of their Senses, since it is not contrary to either of them, and so both of them may Subscribe. And you your self tell them so, when you say, *that the Articles belong to neither of them* : for then certainly both may Subscribe them. The Fundamental Errour all through your Book seems to be this, That the *Bishop* allows a Latitude in Things *determined* by the *Articles* : Whereas all the Latitude he contends for in the *Articles*, is, *That they have not Determin'd them*. If you say, that nothing Undetermin'd is found in the *Articles* : This is not so much against the *Bishop's* Latitude, as against Truth : For there are plainly many things, *contained* in the *Articles*, not Determin'd, as I shall have occasion to show hereafter. But, to proceed, *Supposing the Articles not clear, there are many Helps for the Understanding them, of the same Authority with the Articles, the Rubrick, Homilies, &c.* This is certainly true, That we cannot, *in Honesty*, Subscribe the *Articles* in any sense different from any thing Determin'd in any of these, because we likewise Subscribe these ; and our Subscriptions cannot *honestly* contradict one another. *But there are the Writings of those that liv'd from that time downwards, by way of sure Tradition, and the Practice of the Church.* The latter no body denies good, where it don't contradict any of the fore-mention'd Rules. But the Writings you talk of, what are they for ? Why, *to tell us the meaning of the Church, in the Articles.* Why so ? When the *Articles* are as plain as the *Writings* themselves. But in what are these *Writings* to instruct us ? In Things *concerning true Religion, and necessary Discipline* ? As for them, the *Articles* have sufficiently and plainly *determin'd* them. What then ? In things *not determined by the Articles* ? Or, In the manner how we are to understand those Things that are Determin'd, which it self is not ? You don't mean this, sure : If you do, I must beg your pardon ; because I think, that as they who compil'd the *Articles* have plainly Determin'd all that's *necessary* ; so, they did not intend to put their Opinions upon us, about the manner of our understanding them, which is not necessary. It's needless to put such a Complement upon them ; and unacceptable 'twould be, because not desir'd by them. For Example ; If I knew that their Opinion had been, that all Church-Government, without *Episcopacy*, was contrary to the Law of God, and that there were Abroad no *lawful Ministers* but such as are *Episcopally Ordain'd* ; Should I scruple to Subscribe the *Article* because of this, were I my self of another Opinion ? They did not intend, I'm sure, I should ; because there's nothing like it in the *Article*. As for what they have express'd in the *Article*, I don't want their *Books* to tell me what they meant by it ; and what they have not, I don't think my self oblig'd to follow them in. Their Opinion may be true in it, and the contrary may be true ; and it is no matter, *as to my Subscription, which I take.* For sure, *such Men* as they, so qualify'd *with Integrity, and Skill in Style*, could not chuse but express themselves so as to be fully understood in what was of *so general Concern*. And therefore, if you please, the *Articles* alone will serve my

turn

turn, *as to Subscription* ; though, for understanding the Reasons and Grounds of them, their Writings may be of excellent Use, as the *Bishop* has shown. And every one who is admitted to the Ministry, ought to Thank him, that He has with so much Pains collected, and with so much Judgment stated the different Opinions Men have had concerning those Things contained in the *Articles* ; and shown how far they will agree to, and are to be comprehended in the *Articles* ; that He has with such Strength represented the Arguments on which those Things *determined in the Articles* rest ; and has thus saved them Labour, and Pains, and done for them much better than they could for themselves, either for want of Abilities, or Books. And the *Church* ought to Thank Him, that He has put such a Body of Divinity into her Sons Hands, as will make them fitter to receive her Holy Orders ; which they ought not to enter into, without a tolerable Understanding, not only in the Points *determin'd in the Articles*, but in those lesser ones (in which they can't help having some belief or other) that depend upon, or flow from, those main Points. But in *these* Things they may have wrong Opinions, and yet honestly Subscribe the *Articles* ; as well as a Man may say, that he believes the Scriptures, though he has wrong Notions of some Texts, relating to things not Fundamental. And 'tis in those only, that the Scriptures are liable, by sincere Men, to be mistaken ; as it was only in things not affecting the Purity of Faith, and our own Discipline, that the *Articles* were intended to be General. And when the *Bishop* makes them so, and no farther, He is far from frustrating the Design of the Church ; and introduces but just such a Latitude, as the *Articles* were framed to admit.

Indeed, as the next Paragraph says, 'T would effectually disappoint the Church's Design, to encourage a Latitude in Opinion in Things of such Importance, as not to be left undetermin'd by the Church. But I must tell you again, The Latitude is Encourag'd only in those things that are not of that moment, and are not determin'd. His Rule is, Where the Articles are conceiv'd in large and general Words, and have not more special, and restrained Terms in them, &c. And let any one judge, whether that be not in things not determin'd.

It's nothing therefore to me, whom such a Project would become : For here's no such Project. Let Mr. Baxter's Friends answer for his Projects. The *Bishop's*, I'm sure, is what becomes Him : though your Comparisons are not what become a prudent and candid Man, however you may think they become you.

And now comes, after these two Paragraphs of Preparation and Heightning, the Charge upon His Lordship, in the old strain ; That he has given way for People to come in, of different Opinions, even in Things determined by the Articles. How often, and how positively soever you affirm this, (and you do it very often, and very positively) the softest Answer I can give you, is, That it is a Mistake, and a very gross Mistake. But we must observe what follows. Let it, say you, be never so authentically any other way explain'd what the meaning of the Church is, it matters not ; My Lord of Sarum has made no Proviso : but if the Article will bear it, or, if a Man be but good Grammarian enough to make it, in his opinion, bear

bear it, he may *Subscribe in his own sense, and all's well.* Well, and so it is. For, 1. If the Man be an honest Man, and in his Conscience think the words will bear it, he may *Subscribe*; and if he be not an Honest Man, he'll not ask any Questions about it. And then, 2. Its impossible that a Man, with any degree of *Honesty, or Sense,* can *Subscribe an Article* in a *Sense* contrary to the *Sense of the Church, express'd in any other Authentical Explanations*; because every one of those *Authentical Explanations* (the *Bishop* knows as well as your self) are likewise *Subscribed to*: For, the Church, let me tell you, has Barriers enough against any *Conscientious* Man that differs in Opinion from her; and against a Man that is not so, there's none sufficient. But, 3. For ought you have shown, the *Articles* will not bear a *Grammatical Sense* different from any *Sense* fix'd in any of those *Authentical Explanations*; nor do I believe you can make them, nor any one else. Indeed, you seem to me, not to know what *Grammatical Sense* is, or else you make as if you did not, more effectually to abuse the *Bishop*.

But now for the *Scene for Latitude*; and how far *His Lordship* would have it reach. And to amuse the Reader with a Show of Fairness, you give him *His Lordship's* words; but neatly conceal those before and after. The whole then is thus: *There were Disputes about the Decrees of God; Both Sides appeal'd to the Articles: which look a little, and may be made to favour Both.* Upon this, a Royal Declaration was set forth; in which, after that mention is made of those *Disputes*, and that the Men of all Sides did take the *Articles* to be for them, Order is given for stopping those *Disputes* for the future, and for shutting them in *God's Promises*, as they be generally set forth in the *Holy Scriptures*, and the General Meaning of the *Articles of the Church of England* according to them; and that no Man thereafter should put his own *Sense, or Comment*, to be the Meaning of the Article, but should take it in the *Literal and Grammatical Sense*. (So that, it seems, the Project of a *Literal and Grammatical Sense* was none of the *Bishop's* Invention, though you always give him the Glory of it, but *His Majesty's*, and Confirm'd by *His Declaration*.) In this there has been such a general acquiescing, that the fierceness of these *Disputes* have gone off, while Men have been left to *Subscribe* the *Articles* in their *Literal and Grammatical Sense*. From which Two things are to be inferr'd: 1. That the *Subscription* does import an *Assent* to the Article. 2. That an Article being conceiv'd in such General Words, that it can admit of different *Literal and Grammatical Senses*, even when the *Senses* are plainly contrary one to another; Both Sides may *Subscribe* the Article with a good Conscience, and without any *Equivocation*: and so on, as you quote. And then the *Bishop* concludes; *Where the Articles are conceived in large and general Words, and have not more special and restrained Terms in them; we ought to take it for a sure Indication, that the Church does not intend to tie Men up too severely, &c.* Now upon this, let me ask a few Questions. Was it fair, to conceal the *King's Declaration*, and lay that upon the *Bishop*, which you that laid it, with great Respect to Authority, think so blameable? Don't the *Declaration* say the very same thing

thing with the *Bishop*? For, Doth it not say, that the *General Expression* will *Literally and Grammatically* bear the different particular *Opinions*? Otherwise, how could it pretend to *shut up those Differences in the Words of the Article*? Don't it suppose, that the *Articles* are worded in *General Terms*; and therefore, that they ought not to be drawn to any *Particular Opinion*, or Interpretation of the *General Terms*? And is not this the very same the *Bishop* says, when he shows how *different Grammatical particular Senses* may every one of them be fairly, and without *Prevarication*, Subscribed to, under the *general Word*? And does not the *Proclamation* not only allow the same *Largeness and Equity* with the *Bishop*, but Order that no one restrain or check it, by making the *general Words of the Article* bear their *particular Sense*, exclusive of the others? If these things are true, you ought to beg the *Bishop's Pardon*, and the *Declaration's*, for abusing them; and act hereafter according to the *Largeness and Equity of the Bishop*, which is founded upon the *Order of the King*.

The next Paragraph is exactly and fully true: For those are certainly all the words in the *Third Article*. And as the expression *Hell*, is *general*; so, I fancy, it may make a shift to signify all the *three things* the *Bishop* would have it. Though, if it signify'd but *two* of them, 'twere as good as two thousand. Two of them you never deny; but that of *Hell's* being the *Grave*, you do. It's *Nonsense*, you say, to think the *Article* should say, *As He died, and was buried, so likewise He descended into the Grave*; that is, *was buried*. All the fault here lies in the *Tautology*; and that *Tautology* is vouch'd by no less Men than *Usher, Hammond, Pearson, Stillingfleet, Barrow, and Lightfoot*; Men sure of Learning, Honesty, and Steadiness to the *Church of England*. The *Bishop* has not given any Hint, to make it thought his Opinion: But whose soever Opinion it is, I'll do him the kindness to transcribe a few Sentences out of *Dr. Barrow*, to Vindicate the *Tautology* of it; which may serve for an Answer to the Work you make about it. It is possible, (and might be declared so by many like Instances) and perhaps not unlikely, that they (*viz.* who put these words, *descended into Hell*, into the *Creed*) might both themselves upon probable Grounds believe, and for plausible Ends propound to others the belief of, this Proposition, without apprehending any distinct Sense thereof. And after: If we interpret this *Descent into Hell*, of Our Saviour's Interment, we shall be sure therein not to err; the Proposition being most certainly true, so understood: we shall also hereby be able fairly to satisfy the first and best (if not the only) Reason of this Proposition's being commended to our belief. If it be objected, That this was before express'd in plain words, *dead and buried*, and so is a needless Repetition: I answer, 1. That this Objection concerns them who inserted the words there, who yet (even supposing the Truth of this Exposition) might be excusable, as suspecting it possible that Our Saviour's being *in Hell*, might imply more than this, although they knew not what distinctly. And, 2. That a greater Inconvenience seems to arise from Expounding them otherwise; it reflecting upon the more ancient Compilers both of this and most other Creeds.

Creeds who left them out ——— Nay, upon St. Paul himself, who mentions only Christ's Death, Burial, and Resurrection, 1 Cor. 15. 4. Whoever will look into Dr. Barrow's *Exposition*, may find a great deal more to the same purpose. And no one need think it any Affront, to say of the Compilers of our *Articles*, what Dr. Barrow thought it none, to the Inserters of this Passage into the *Creed*, to say of them: seeing the *Article* too means but just as much as the *Creed*; and its Compilers took the words from thence, perhaps without any distinct Opinion about them at all, but only as so many words that they found there.

But supposing my Lord of Sarum had made a Mistake here, the thing that He brings these three different Senses to prove, will stand just as well confirm'd. For if the *Article* can be honestly Subscribed in but Two Grammatical Senses, these will uphold the intended *Latitude* as well as Two Thousand: seeing those Two are as contrary to one another as the Three are, or as any of the Two Thousand significations of the word would be, supposing it had so many. Should then my Lord of Sarum persuade others to be of his Mind, (though there are very few but what are already well satisfy'd that the *Articles* will bear different particular Senses) Men of different Opinions might all Subscribe, without being wide of the Sense of the *Church*, which has left Men room enough to enjoy their own particular Opinions, in Subscribing to the general Words of the *Articles*. Will you have the face to say, that a Man who has the Opinion, that Christ descended into the Place of Torment, cannot safely, without *Prevarication*, Subscribe this *Article*? That, we know, was the Opinion of those that first Penn'd it, and was never contradicted. Or, May not he likewise, whose Opinion is, that his Soul went into the Place of departed Souls, the *Hades*, with Dr. Pearson? We know, the *Church* design'd not to exclude these; since though they did not condemn the former Opinion, yet they took off the Restriction to it which was in the former *Article*. If they Both may, then here's Room enough for Men to enjoy their own private Opinions, notwithstanding their Subscribing the *Articles*. If they may not, shew us what the *Church*, in all likelihood, intended, out of any of her *Authentic* Explanations. Till you can do that, in all these Cases, we must imagine, that the *Church*, when she used general Words, intended not to Exclude any from Subscribing, who hold any of the particular Senses comprehended under those general Words. We are not to fix our particular Sense to what the *Church* has left general; nor are those that differ from us to do it: but we must Subscribe the Words in the Grammatical Sense as they stand; and then, as the *Proclamation* with good reason supposes, All may Subscribe: since every particular Sense is a fairly Grammatical one of the general Word. And yet here's no scope at all for to evade the force of the Subscriptions, Declarations, and Engagements. For we still cannot get out of that, which the *Church* would confine us to, the general Word: For that will hold a Man, do what he can, that comes up to these measures. We have our freedom to chuse which of the particular Senses seems

seems most reasonable, but yet cannot evade Subscribing to the general Word, and being confined to some received Sense of that Word by our Subscription. So that your Expressions are a little too hot ; *No sort of Security can be had ; Nothing can hold them.* Sure you take *Grammatical Sense*, for some strange Thing or other : or else your Heat hath carry'd you out of your Knowledge. When you have settled your Notions about it, I hope you'll cool your Expressions, and let it be some Restraint ; though it teach you to allow *such a Largeness and Equity as would take off the Occasion given for unjust Censure.*

But you do not know what *His Lordship means by Unjust Censure.* How perfectly unacquainted Men are with themselves ! But you suppose *His Lordship means that about the Number of Articles : But That*, you say, *His Lordship has removed effectually, by making them things of course, and Men may be of as different Opinions as ever.* This is the most *Unjust Censure* in the World, and deserves worse Words than any one, but he that makes it, will venture to give. I must, in plain terms, say, It is Dishonest, for a Man that hath Eyes, to pass over that full Answer my Lord of Sarum gives to that Objection, in the 1st, 2d, 3d, 4th and 5th Pages of the *Introduction*, and put it upon the World as his own : and to say, *he has left room for as different Opinions as ever.* I suppose you mean, that, with his *Grammatical Sense*, a Roman Catholick may Subscribe the *Article* of the *Sacraments* ; or an *Anabaptist*, that of *Baptism* ; or a *Jew*, that of *Christ's Resurrection* ; or a *Mahometan*, all of them. Do you mean so ? If you do, pray show us how. If they can't, then we find *Grammatical Sense* will Exclude some People ; and even all that were designed to be Excluded. For in all the *Articles* concerning Things of great Moment, the words are full as strict as in these ; but are left *general* and *undetermin'd* only as to things of *less moment.* But to give you an Answer. What, I suppose, *His Lordship meant by Unjust Censure*, was, That the Clergy are of different Minds, after the Subscribing of the *Articles*, from one another, and from the *Articles* themselves ; and that they must therefore, some of them, when they Subscribe them, act against their Consciences. Now one of the *Bishop's* Opinion, could tell a Man that should thus accuse us, That our Differences were about things *not determin'd* in the *Articles* : That we did not fix our *particular* Opinions as the Sense of the *general* Word, but left those who differ'd as to the *particular* Explanation of it, or Thoughts about it, to Subscribe the *general* Word with as good Sense, and as clear a Conscience as our selves, according to the Liberty that the Church it self allow'd them, when it us'd such general Expressions. And, *If all Men would understand the Articles with such Largeness and Equity, there would not be that Occasion given for Unjust Censure that there has been, and by you is.*

That my Lord of Sarum makes the *Articles* only things of course, by allowing different *Grammatical Senses*, is no forc'd Consequence, you say. I think I've shown it is, when I show'd, that, allowing all the different *Grammatical Senses* you

you could of a Word, yet some body would be Excluded by It, and as many as the *Church* intended. And if we descend to Particulars, we shall find it with a witness. For in all the Examples you have given of *my Lord of Sarum's Equity*, you have not once shown that He has allowed any *Latitude* which the *Church* does not; that He hath not fully seconded the Design She did propose to herself in framing the Articles; or that He has Let in any *Sectary*, or *Man of unorthodox Principles*.

You tell us indeed, you'll show us, and show us over again; but when we come to see the Sight, we find only such Mis-representations, such forced and manifest straining of his Words, against the Sense he has so copiously asserted, that we must say the *Bishop* has occasion to complain of the Injustice, and at the same time to appeal to the Justice of God, as you ought to do to His Mercy, if your Accusations and Insinuations be found at last to be nothing but Slander. But to come to your Instances.

The Sixth Article says; *In the Name of Holy Scripture, we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose Authority was never any Doubt in the Church. These Words, you say, if we look no farther, but take them by themselves, without connecting them to what follows, will easily bear such a Grammatical Sense, as to exclude several of the Epistles.* A very pretty Fancy this is of *Grammatical Sense*; the taking a piece of an *Article*, without connecting it to the rest. For my part, I have always had such a silly Notion of *Grammar*, as to think the connexion of the parts of a Sentence, or of two Sentences or more together, was a part of it. Its impossible to any one, who knows what it is, to make that *Grammatical Sense* out of the former part of the *Article*, without considering the latter part of it, which determines the former, and explains the Rule laid down, viz. *The Catalogue of the Books of the Old Testament*; and this general Clause, *All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly receiv'd, we do receive, and account them Canonical.* He must make a Sense of the first Sentence quite contrary to what the second determines: Which suppose he could *Grammatically* do, would be of no use; because he must Subscribe this latter part of the *Article*, as well as the former. And then, if he cannot force a *Grammatical Sense* of this to agree with the former, he must Subscribe very *honestly* to two Contradictions. So likewise, if he could make a *Grammatical Sense* of any one whole *Article*, which would not agree with the Sense fix'd in another *Article*, or in any other *Authentic Explanation* of the *Church's* Mind, 'twould signifie just nothing; because he must Subscribe them also. And he must be an odd sort of a Man, that can Subscribe to Contradictions. As for the *Bishop's* questioning that Text that you speak of; if it be contrary to the *Article*, then all *Various Lections* are so too. And whoever prefers any of them to the received one; or indeed, whoever prefers another *Translation* of any Word to the received one, falls within the Accusation. No wonder Dr. *Mills* don't publish his *Testament*, when it is full of nothing but *Heterodoxy*; of which, it seems, the *Greek Testament* we have had from *Oxford* already must stand

stand condemn'd. As for the word *Hell*, 'tis Answer'd already ; and if you will but look upon the *Bishop's Explanation* of that *Article*, you'll find he did see the *So also* ; in pag. 57. l. 22.

The VIIIth Article obliges us to believe the Three Creeds : For it says, *They may be prov'd by most certain Warrants from Holy Scripture* : which Reason, he that Subscribes the *Article*, also Subscribes to. You say, *That a Man, with a good far-fetch'd Grammatical Sense, may say, That the Foundation of the Creeds being received is Scripture-proof ; and a Man may be judge whether they are so to be proved, and believe them accordingly.* Were the Words, as in the *Article* of Councils, That they are to be believed as far as they can be proved from Scripture, this were true. But now, as they stand, here are Two direct Assertions ; one the Reason of the other. And I Subscribe to them both ; and cannot in any sense Subscribe, if I don't both believe the *Creeds*, and believe they can be prov'd from Scripture. *As far indeed as a thing is built upon a wrong Supposition, so far it is not to be suppos'd Obligatory.* But when I Subscribe to the Truth of the *Supposition*, I can never get off then either from the Obligation to believe *that*, or the thing founded upon it. And this is the Case in the *Article*.

You say, *Nothing else can excuse my Lord's managing the Article.* Why then, it is not worth His while to be excus'd. *His Lordship proves the Nice and Athanasius Creed not to be what they are call'd.* If they are not, He has done right, not to serve the Church with a Fraud. And at last, 'tis no more than the *Article* it self has done by the *Apostles Creed*. He then strips them of all Authority from Councils or Antiquity. The Church has left them bare of it too, and fix'd 'em only upon the foot of Proof from Scripture. And had He at all given them that Authority from Antiquity and Councils that you pretend, it would signifie nothing ; since those Councils must come upon the same foot of Scripture by the *Twenty-first Article*. What Grounds collateral to Scripture you believe them upon, I don't concern my self with ; but I'm sure, that alone is as strong as can be : Because whatever I say is certainly warranted from Scripture, I must believe as Scripture ; and I can believe nothing more firmly than I do that. But it is not true, that my Lord of Sarum says, that as far as they want Proof from Scripture, they are not to be believ'd, notwithstanding your Subscription. No : He says, *We believe them, because we believe the Doctrine declar'd in them, is contain'd in the Scriptures.* His because, is positive : And if you do not believe they are so contain'd ; He, and Grammatical Sense, will both tell you, that you cannot honestly Subscribe the *Article*. What Pretence then, or Excuse can you alledge, for your fixing it upon the Bishop, as his Sense, that you may Subscribe this *Article*, and yet believe the Creeds only as far as they are, in your Opinion, contain'd in Scripture.

In the Subscribing the next Ten Articles, you say, there is a Scene laid for Latitude inconsistent with the Church's Design ; for the Bishop has stated Questions under them with such an Indifference, as sufficiently encourages Subscribing in any of those Senses : though some of the Opinions are no better than Heresie, &c. But

you will not descend to Particulars ; they will fall better under the particular Examination of the Articles. Till then, I must let them alone for an Answer. For the present, I can only say, That I can find no such thing : But I find in the XVIIth a particular Head, to show, *how far we of this Church are determin'd by the Article, and how far we are at liberty to follow any of those different Opinions.* And the Bishop must have strangely fail'd of his Purpose, if He have, notwithstanding this, done as you say. In another place, his Accusation upon this Head, is, *stating Questions under these Articles that they have nothing to do with.* I don't know how you'll make these agree : For if the Articles have nothing to do with those Opinions, I can't find any fault in stating them with such an Indifference as sufficiently encourages Subscribing in any of those Senses. Which you cannot but allow any one to do ; since you say the Church is not at all to be brought into those Disputes, as we shall see presently you do ; tho' yet you say here, *There is a Scene laid in them for Latitude, inconsistent with its Design.* I am pretty confident, had you known any of those Heretical Particulars, we should have had them ; for you are not so sparing of your Paper, but that you can spoil ten times as much, as those Particulars would have taken up, in the needless Repetition of your General Accusation.

Now we come to the Articles, for the sake of which, in all likelihood, this Scheme for Latitude was fram'd. How come you to know the Bishop's Mind so exactly ? He gives another Account of his Design himself. But you will not believe what a Man says, when 'twould justifie ; but will guess at what he thinks, at a venture ; and make it contrary to what he says, that you may condemn him. But if the Bishop is such a bitter Enemy to Church, and Church-Government, as to have taken the Pains to Expound away all the other Articles, merely to get his Ends of these ; yet I hope King Charles I. and Archbishop Laud, were no such sad Levellers, as to have had any such comprehending Thoughts : and 'twas the Declaration that laid the Scheme for Latitude you rail at, and the Bishop has only cited the very Words of that. The Bishop then had not, when he began, these Articles before his Eyes, if we may believe him. Nor will the Scheme at all hurt them ; though, if it did, the King and the Archbishop must answer for it, whom you have wounded through the Bishop's sides ; so blind, and so resolved, is your Anger.

The Words of the XIXth Article you have set down. You say, *The Definition here given, is very plainly restrain'd to a Regular Administration of the Sacraments according to Christ's Ordinance, and so it is as to the Preaching part also.* I don't know what you mean by very plain ; but if you can see any thing like what you speak of, you have better Eyes than I have. The Article says, *in all things that of necessity are requisite to the same.* Now I think it is very plain, even as plain as words can make it, That the Sacraments may be Administred in all things that of Necessity are requisite to the same, and yet the Administration be far from Regular. Nay, your self shall confess this, except you have quite forgot your Logick. For you say, *The Definition is*
given

given of the Church of Christ in General. Now then, a Definition of a *Church in General*, must have nothing in it but what *is* and *must be* in every particular ; that is, nothing but what constitutes the very *Essence* of a *Church* ; and which being taken away, the *Church* it self is destroyed. Now if you'll say, that *Regularity in Administration of the Sacraments* is Necessary to the very *Being of the Sacraments*, and consequently to the *Being of the Church* ; then you may come off from contradicting *your self*, but not *common Reason*. For there are such things as *Irregular Churches* ; which 'twere impossible there should be, were *Regularity* a Part of their *Essence*. Were you your self to define a *Man in general* ; Would you put any thing into the Definition, but what every One must have *necessarily*, if he be call'd a *Man* ; or would you define him to be *Handsome*, which only some few are ? Just so it is here ; the Definition is of a *Church*, and not of a *Pure Church*. So that the *Bishop of Sarum* had done Right to the *Article*, had he only told us what was *indispensably necessary* to the *Being of a Church*, and how it might truly be call'd a *Church*, if it had those Things that were so necessary : but over and above *that*, he gives us Cautions, That All *Churches* are not to be Communicated with, without Sin ; That they may have all Things in them *Necessary* to make them *Churches*, and yet be so far *vitiating*, as to oblige us to leave them. And if this be not pressing the *Necessity of doing things Regularly*, when there is no necessity to do them otherwise ; but be, as you say it is, *labouring Ways and Means to Evade the Force of the Article*, I have done. I cannot here but take notice of an Instance of your *Charity and Integrity*, in this Paragraph. You say, *When we come to look in the Exposition, we find my Lord of Sarum can so Contrive the Matter, and Evade the Force of the Article to that degree, that if Men are Baptiz'd, it matters very little by whom it be done ; though, according to Christ's Ordinance, the doing of it belongs to a distinct Order of Men, &c.* He allows indeed, that the being Baptized by those that ought not to do it, &c. does not destroy the *Being of the Sacrament* ; nor the *allowing* it, the *Being of a Church* : but as for *saying it matters not*, all those Cautions about the Purity of a Church show He did not *think* so. I'll give you a Sentence or two, that are contrary, in plain terms, to what you affirm of His Lordship. [Pag. 181.] *We think none ought to Baptize, but Men dedicated to the Service of God, and Ordained according to that Constitution that was settled in the Church by the Apostles.* And a little after ; *A plain Difference is made between our owning that a Church may retain the Fundamentals of Christianity, a true Baptism, and true Orders ; and our joining with that Church in such Acts as are, we think, so far vitiating, that they become unlawful to us to do them, &c.* What ? are *Honesty and Justice* nothing but mere Names ? and the *Day of Judgment* nothing, when every *idle Word* is to be accounted for ? Is this the *Charity of the Christian Religion* ? and is it grown a *Mark of Christ's Disciples*, to accuse their Brethren maliciously, against clear Eye-sight and Knowledge ? I wish you would consider this, and make your Acknowledgment as publick and plain

as your Abuse is: and if you can't help your Understanding; yet hereafter govern your Passions, and keep them from hurrying you into wilful *Slanders*. A Man cannot *honestly* lay Words to any one's charge, directly contrary to what that Person says, and he must see before him; but a Man may *honestly*, in the *simplicity* of his Heart, make a Blunder in his Reasoning, and his Understanding or Explanation of a Sentence: And therefore, though you're to be *blam'd* for the Instance I have given; yet, for some other things in this Paragraph, you are only to be *pity'd*.

In *Article* the XXth, you say, *The Words will bear a Grammatical Sense, to which a Man may Subscribe, notwithstanding he may think the Church hath no Power to Enforce Rites or Ceremonies.* The words are these; *The Church hath Power to Decree Rites or Ceremonies.* Now, how a Man can Subscribe this, and yet think the *Church* hath no Power, I don't understand. This is *Grammatical Non-sense*. Oh, but you say, *That the Article does not say Any are bound to Observe them.* Power is generally taken to be a *Relative*: And therefore how the *Church* can have Power, and *No-body* that it has Power over, you must make out. And sure, All those *whom* it has Power over, are bound to Obey its Power in *Decreeing Rites or Ceremonies*. When I say, The Ordinary has Power to Command things to be Read in Divine Service; Isn't it the same thing as if I should say, *All under his Power*, (and Somebody there must be under it, if he have it) are bound to Obey that Command? So when I say, *The Church has Power to Decree Rites and Ceremonies*; I plainly say, All under her Power, All in the *Church*, are bound to Observe that *Decree*; if it be within the due Bounds of her Power. And so, for the latter part of the *Article*, *The Church has Authority in Matters of Faith*; I cannot believe you think Any one can *Grammatically* Subscribe it, and yet believe She has no Authority. What measure he sets in his Mind, to that Power, and that Authority, I am not to examine. For the *Article* has worded it so loosely, that it does not Exclude Those who have lower Notions of the *Church's* Power. And no One can Subscribe the *Articles*, but by that very Subscription he allows the *Church* such an Authority as will make him very capable of Subscribing this *Article* in a very good Sense. When you shew how the *Explanation of other Articles* does not consist with the Power the *Church* is allowed in this, I shall find what to say to you. Now I can't, because I know not Particulars.

In the XXIst, *Councils* are brought to the Test of Scripture; and their *Decrees* are no farther Valid, than they are agreeable to *Holy Scripture*. You say, *This will affect our Creeds*. One of them, we know, was never Confirm'd by a *Council*; and yet we must as firmly believe it, as any of the rest; because we have Subscrib'd, that it may be prov'd from *Holy Scripture*. You seem to bring this *Article*, and that of the *Creeds*, upon the Level: Whereas that was made, to confirm the *Creeds*, and settle and fix the Belief of them upon us; and this, quite the contrary, to show that *General Councils* were not so firmly to be trusted to. If that of the *Creeds* had been worded like this;

this; *The Three Creeds are not to be believed, unless it may be shown that they are taken out of the Holy Scriptures*; it would have made me suspect, there was something in them not so to be proved. And had this been worded, as that of the *Creeds* is, *The Decrees of General Councils are firmly to be received, and believed, for that they are to be proved by certain Warrants out of Holy Scripture*; I should have thought my self oblig'd, in Subscribing it, to have believ'd the *Decrees*; and also, that they were proved by *certain Scripture*. But as they now stand: He that can make, for they are, and, not unless they are, the same thing, has a knack at *Grammar* beyond any ordinary Capacity.

The XXIII^d Article is that, of *Ministring in the Congregation*. And in this the *Church* has been so careful, that She has provided Bars, over and over again, against an *Irregular Admission*: and all these you take care to count up. The Use I make of your Catalogue is this: That since those things you mention, are to be Subscrib'd to, as well as this *Article*, it would be no matter if the *Article* did not Exclude any of them; since there are many Provisions against *Presbyterians*, and *Independents*, in all those other things, which its impossible they should get over. You'd make as if every *Article* in the Set, was made against every *Body*; and if the *Bishop* does but interpret any one, as you think, so as to let in a dangerous Man, you flie at him, though there are ten or twelve other Guards which he must make his way through, before he can have entrance. But yet I'll venture to put it upon this, That if the *Bishop* has interpreted this *Article* against the *Grammatical Sense*, or the *Sense of the Church* in any other of Her Books, he has done wrong.

The Words of the *Article* you give us: and the latter part of it, we find, determines and defines the General Expression in the former.

Every One, you say, that lives in England, knows, that according to the Constitution of our Church, the Persons who have Publick Authority to send Labourers into the Vineyard, are Bishops. Every One does know it; and every Church of England-Man, and the Bishop among the rest, thinks that no One can, Subscribe this *Article*, but who Acknowledges it: (Though, if they could, 'twould signifie nothing; since, by Subscribing, they acknowledge a Power in the Bishop who imposes the Subscription; and since there are, by Subscription to other Articles and Rules, so many Bars against any Dangerous Opinions in these Cases.) For He plainly says, (to the very same sense that you do at the beginning of this Paragraph;) p. 258. *That which we believe to be Lawful Authority, is that Rule which the Body of the Pastors, or the Bishops and Clergy of a Church, shall settle, being met in a Body, under a due Respect to the Powers that God shall set over them.* And no One can make the *Article* bear any Grammatical Sense, so as to take in any of those Men you speak of: since no One can pretend, that they are Call'd by Men who have Publick Authority given them to send them. At least, if some Men should understand Grammar and Sense so little, as to think 'twill bear it, we have other Bars they cannot leap over; and their Mistake is not to be laid to the Charge

Charge of the *Declaration*, but to their own want of Sense : nor to the *Bishop*, who plainly affirms no such Use can be made on't, in the words before : except you'll say, *their Ordainers are the Pastors of our National Church, and Met under a due Respect to the Civil Authority.* And therefore, I wonder how you can have the Confidence to say, that *we find another Story told*, and then quote words of the *Bishop's* for it, which plainly refer not to *our Church*, but to the *Churches abroad* : which the *Article* casts so favourable an Eye upon, as not to condemn, though at the same time it does not directly approve of them. The Words of the *Article* you can't deny to be *general*, and not appropriated to any *particular Constitution*, as the *Bishop* says ; though every One that Subscribes them, does by that Subscription oblige himself to think *None lawfully Called*, in *our Constitution*, but the *Episcopally Ordained Clergy* ; being no others can here be said to be sent by *Men who have Publick Authority* given them to send *Labourers into the Lord's Vineyard.*

The *Bishop's Suggestion*, you say, is to bring *our Church upon the Level with the Churches abroad, after Calvin's Model.* He plainly says, *Ours had been less forced to go out of the beaten-Path, than any other.* How is this a Level ; when he plainly affirms, that *Our Reformation was more Regular than Theirs, as having gone less from those Rules that ought to be Sacred in Regular Times ?* This we shall have Occasion to speak of more fully in the Third Head ; as we shall likewise presently, of the *Magisterial Stiffness of some Hotter Spirits*, which so disturbs you, and caused you to utter that *charitable Reflexion* at the End of this Paragraph.

How you can imagine the *Bishop* should wish for a *Change*, I can't understand ; except you think He's willing to part with *one Constitution*, for *another* which He declares *less Regular.*— *My Lord of Sarum* no where supposes an *Independent* or *Presbyterian* can Subscribe this *Article.* He plainly Excludes Them, as I have shown before : And the *Church* hath sufficiently provided, if he had not, in this *Article*, That no such Man shall Come in, if he have any *Honesty* or *Conscience* in him ; and if He have not, there's no Remedy. But if you're for having a Way, I'll tell you one. Do but you, or any of your Writing Friends for you (*whose Credit will now go as far with an Independent, or Presbyterian, as any one's*) prove, that a *House of Presbyters*, Met by the Call of the *Archbishop*, is co-ordinate with, and independent upon, a *House of Bishops*, to whom they have Sworn *Canonical Obedience* ; That they are Impower'd to Adjourn Themselves, and Act separately from Them, &c. and I'll promise you, Not only They you speak of, but Every One else, who having Subscrib'd to such an Obedience, may have some *Scruple of Acting according to it*, and to the Nature of *Our Constitution*, shall, upon such Demonstration, think all that relates to *Episcopacy*, or *Obedience*, mere *Outward Formalities.* Such an Advantage will such a notable Discovery give all that are *ill-Wishers to the Church* as now Establish'd in *Bishops* Superiour to *Presbyters.* But as you have not shown, that the *Bishop* has said any thing like that you lay to his Charge ; so, I'm satisfy'd, you never can.

And

And then, if this *Ordination* be, by the *Bishop's Exposition*, the *Grammatical Sense*, and the *Obligation* our Subscription to other things lays upon us, made necessary to be thought the *Lawful Ordination* by every Subscriber: And if likewise the *Article of Rites and Ceremonies*, which you your self, against your Will, acknowledge the *Bishop* has not damag'd, remain firm; your Fears, in this next Paragraph, of things being brought to a hopeful pass, by those you jeeringly call *Worthy Men*, many of which are unworthily so abus'd, will be foolishly vain and ungrounded. For, supposing they could get over all the *Articles*; you can't be so fond, as to fear *Order and Decency* should be quite confounded and ruin'd, when these Men, before they leave their own, to seize upon your *Parochial Meetings*, must *Subscribe*, and declare their *unfeigned Assent and Consent* to the Use of all the Things contained in the *Book of Common Prayer*, and therein, to the *Rules of Order and Decency* in the *Rubrick*?

And thus we have done with this Topick; in the handling of which, you have shown a particular Disrespect to the *Bishop*, and to *Truth*; and a Temper which carries not the *Face of Christianity*, or *Moderation*; and have thereby done good Service to some People, who rejoyce at our Divisions. If indeed, what you call *Grammatical Sense*, were so, it might do mischief to the *Church*, and *Learning*, and bring *Grammar* and *Non-sense* to be the same thing. But, if rightly consider'd, and apply'd, it is so certainly true, and so fully answerable to the Design of the *Church*, that I'm resolv'd you shall not be so civil to the *Bishop*, as to let him carry away the Honour of the first Attempt in it; but will have that *Latitudinarian*, King *Charles I.* first serv'd, who not only Encourag'd, but Commanded it, and that by the Advice of *Archbishop Laud*.

The next Comparison (though you civilly say *there is none*) of the *Bishop* with *Davenport* and *Baxter*, is very Unjust, and is indeed design'd for no End but Abuse; because there is not any Argument in it, their Actions not at all respecting the *Bishop*. You have shown us by this, as by the rest of your Proceedings, that *Fryars* are not the only Persons that cannot pretend to *Sincerity*, or *Writing in Earnest*, when they are to encounter an *Adversary*. One thing, however, I cannot but commend the *Fryar* for, and that is, that he had the Wit to know, that *Grammatical Sense* was not for his Purpose, and therefore went another way to work: whereas you count, *Grammatical Sense* would have done his Business.

I won't say how great a Complement you have put upon the *Roman Catholics*; and what a piece of service you have done the *Church*, by supposing, that the *Grammatical Sense* of Our *Articles* is *Popish*: but shall, as fairly as I can, set *Grammatical Sense* in a True Light; which, as, I hope, it may inform you; so, I doubt not, will fully evince, that our *Articles* are not favourable to them. If the Truth were known, 'twas nothing but the *Grammatical Sense* of the *Articles*, that *Davenport* was so confounded by: with which it's no hard matter to run down any one that pretends to reconcile them to the Council of Trent.

Gram.

Grammatical Sense, is that Sense which arises from some proper and received Signification of a *Word*, consider'd according to the Relation it bears to the other *Words* with which it is connected in the *Sentence*, and the Connexion of the *Sentence* it stands in, to the other Parts of the *Whole Discourse*. 1st. Every Word must be taken in some received and proper Sense of it; nor is it lawful to put a Sense upon any Word, as we please, contrary to the Use among those that speak the Tongue. And farther, to determine the Sense of the Word: It must be always such an one as is not contrary to the rest of the Sentence, but agrees with those other Words to which it bears a Relation. A Word may have many Significations equally Proper, and in Use: but yet not equally Proper in that place in which it is fix'd, where it may possibly be determin'd necessarily to only one. But, 3^{dly}. If the Sentence in which the Word stands, do not sufficiently Determine it, yet always that Sentence must be consider'd as bearing Relation to, and being Agreeable with, the other Parts of the Whole Discourse; and consequently, no Word in it must be taken in such a Sense as is contrary or prejudicial to any thing contain'd in that Discourse. Thus then, to apply it. When we Subscribe to any thing that the *Church* requires, towards an Admission; we must understand every Word we Subscribe, in some received and proper Sense: we must understand it in a Sense, consonant to the rest of the Sentence in which it is, and to which we likewise Subscribe; and in a Sense agreeable to every thing else that the *Church* thinks necessary to impose the Subscription of, upon us; that is, to all that the *Church* says: For I don't count, that the *Church* says any thing, but that which it obliges All that Come in to it to Agree to; and which, by imposing no more, it shows, it thinks sufficient for any One's being properly call'd its Son. I hope I have made *Grammatical Sense* a thing strict and severe enough to please you. You your self, in your Accusation of the *Bishop*, always make his Fault such as will come within this Determination of *Grammatical Sense*: for you make it, Allowing a Latitude in Things Determined by the *Church*. And yet, to make his Crime look the more grievous and silly, you would not show how he had transgressed his own Rule of *Grammatical Sense*, (which He must have done, if your Accusation be true,) but Ridicule the Rule it self, and Rail at *Grammatical Sense* likewise: I suppose, lest you should be kept too close to the Matter in hand: which, considering what you had Undertaken, it was not your Interest to be. Now you see, I dare venture the Cause, to an Issue, upon the Ground of your Accusation, That the *Bishop* has Encourag'd a Latitude in Things Determin'd; and desire He may stand or fall, as He is found to have Acted according to, or Transgressed, His Rule, *Grammatical Sense*; which I allow to be transgressed, by Encouraging a Latitude in what the Articles have Determin'd. And so does He Himself: for in the Explanation of His Rule, all the Latitude He contends for, is in those Things that are left General and Unrestrain'd. Where-ever different Opinions will agree well to some received Sense of every Word, consider'd in the Relation it bears

bears to the rest of the Sentence ; that Sentence likewise being consider'd with relation to the Whole Discourse ; there, and there only, does he claim an Allowance of those Different Opinions : as I have *in part* shown ; and shall, I hope, *fully*, in what follows.

And this is sufficient to show, That the *Bishop's Latitude* does not introduce *Diversity of Opinions* into the Church, any farther than the *Articles* themselves introduce them. Nor does the *Title of the Articles* at all contradict it ; since this cannot at all hurt *True Religion*. Nor does *Bishop Taylor's Note* at all belong to it ; as having nothing in it but *true Sense, and fair Ingenuity* ; and being so far from *not serving the Ends of Truth, and Holiness*, or of forcing a Sense upon Words, which they will not naturally bear ; that it is the only Way we have to ascertain the Sense which the Church has *Determin'd*, and to silence Those who will pretend to put their *forc'd* Sense upon the Decisions of the Church. It's the only Way we have, of coming to the Right Sense of the *Article*, which, to be sure, is the *Literal and Grammatical* one ; except you'll say, their *true Sense* is neither *Literal nor Grammatical*. It's that Sense which we must take the *Articles* in, or not subscribe ; and is never different in the Doctrines relating to *pure Religion* which are *Determin'd* by the *Articles*, but only in those things of *less moment*, in which the Church has not thought fit to provide against *Diversity of Opinions*, having *Determin'd* us only to the general Word, which alone is sufficient to the Settlement of *True Religion and Discipline among us*, and not to any particular Notion of it, which being *not Necessary*, is *not Determined*.

What you call *Determin'd*, indeed, in the former Paragraph, you only call *Contain'd*, in this : whereas they are not the same. For Things may be *Contain'd* in the *Articles*, as I have said before, which are not *Determin'd* ; as *Particulars* are under a *General*. If you say, That the *Particulars* are not in the *Articles*, but only your *General* ; it will be allow'd you : for it's only a Quibble, and amounts to the very same thing. For all that was ever meant, was, that there were *different Particulars* under the *General*, and *different Manners* of Explaining *some Expressions* ; and 'twas no matter which we took, as to the Honesty of our Subscription : which you your self must acknowledge, if these *Particulars* are not *contain'd* in the *Articles* ; we having a full Liberty of Opinion in all Things not *contain'd* therein. So that, taking either manner of Expressing it, and the manner that His Lordship makes Use of in handling the *Articles* according to it ; we shall find, that neither the *Opinion* it self, nor his *Application* of it, will introduce *such a Latitude as the Articles were fram'd to avoid*.

For it is not a whit larger, than what you allow in your Answering the Objection of the *Moderation of the Church of England* : And by the Measures of that which you lay down, you your self prove the Accusation against His Lordship to be Unjust, and his different *Grammatical Senses* to be Allowable.

You say, *Our Church does not tie Men up at the rate of the Church of Rome, Determining things that are better left Undetermin'd; and forcing an Assent to them, as to things of the greatest Consequence.* This is all that's desir'd to be Allow'd, That the Church has left those things of less Consequence Undetermin'd, and has not forc'd the particular Opinions which are so, upon us, but only has ty'd us down to the general, that being all that's necessary to sound Doctrine, or necessary Discipline.

First: The Moderation of the Church, &c. This Paragraph is certainly true, and is nothing almost but what the Bishop says in his *Introduction*, [p. 7.] in a little better Words, and more close Expressions. To the *Laity* they are only *Articles of Peace*; but to the *Clergy*, otherwise: as He has fully, contrary to what you once or twice more than insinuate, prov'd.

Secondly: Our Church is so far, &c. This is true likewise, with a candid Construction; for it won't bear a very strict one: because of the *also* joined to *accursed*, which looks as if they were *accursed* that held Opinions contrary to the Doctrines before stated.

Thirdly: The Moderation of the Church is very remarkable, in making so very few Doctrines to be Conditions of Communion, contrary to what is objected in the beginning of the Introduction, &c. Objected by whom? You'd fain have People believe by the Bishop: But if they'll look into the *Introduction*, they'll find the full and only Answer to it. The *Objection* is natural enough, and we know has been made even against the *Creeds themselves*, and therefore deserv'd an Answer. The Bishop gives a general one, that will Answer the *Objection*, from the making of the *Creeds*, to the making of the *Articles*; by telling the necessary Occasions that came upon the Church, of making particular Explanations of Her Sense, in those *Fundamental Points*, and our particular Occasions of encreasing the Number of our *Articles* above what they need otherwise have been, for the Exclusion of *Roman Catholicks*. And surely, if the *Objection* were thought worth an Answer, when made only against the *Creeds*, as too particular, in that which the Word of God had made general; How much more is it so, when 'tis made against XXXIX *Articles*, One of which contains all these *Three Creeds*, and the rest farther Limitations of some of the Things contained in them. God forbid that I should say the *Objection* is Just; but yet it is such an one, as nothing but the necessity of the Church, to secure her *Fundamentals*, could answer. And therefore, lest the *Objection* should lie unanswerable against our Church, whose Moderation, I must needs say, you have fully represented; I am resolved never to believe that She has *Determin'd* any thing but what is necessary towards Securing the Doctrines of true Religion, and the necessary Quiet of the Constituted Church. You blame my Lord, that He will have some *Doctrinal Points* found in them: but you assure us, that there's scarce any such thing. The Bishop does not say these *Doctrinal Points* are few or many; nor does He say any thing of it, as to particular *Articles*: He says only, *That in Doctrinal Points a Lay-man may differ, and yet hold*
Communion

Communion with the Church ; for that such Points are not so necessary to Salvation, as that without believing them, no Man hath a Federal Right to the Covenant of Grace ; as Articles of Faith are. And this is not more than you allow, in the First Note of Moderation, where you say, *That a Lay-man is not bound up to a strict Acknowledgment of the Articles, otherwise than as they shall be found to be comprized in the Creeds, or are evidently True in themselves, and may be Proved from Scripture :* That is, no farther than he shall think them so. For if you mean in reality, he's bound to believe them all, because they all may indeed be thus proved ; though there are some things in them, which, whatever he thinks of their Truth, are necessary to him, if he pretends to a Federal Right, and these are Articles of Faith : and others that he may be in the wrong in, and himself think the Church in the wrong in, without being out of the Covenant of Grace, or out of the Communion of the Church. Thus you Allow Doctrinal Points in the Articles, which you blame my Lord for Allowing, not considering your self. Indeed, the main Accusation will fall upon you, as we shall see—— But to go on. You say, *That particularly in the Ten Articles, from the IXth to the XIXth, there are no such.* I believe, you are the very first that ever made them necessary to a Federal Right ; and, according to my Lord of Sarum's Notion, all other but such as are so necessary, are Doctrinal Points. No Man, it seems, can have a different Notion of Original Sin ; or interpret those Places of Scripture, which we bring to prove it, otherwise than the Article determines it, without losing his Right to the Gospel Covenant. No One can be for Absolute Reprobation and Election, (to which Opinion, you say, the Article is contrary) but he loses his Federal Right, and so on. You'd fain make all the Eight, to be equally Articles of Faith, opposed to Doctrinal, with the XVIIIth : whereas this is the Fundamental Doctrine, without which it's impossible for any One to have a Federal Right. Nor are they, because relating to the Fundamental, equally Articles of Faith with it ; because a Man may believe the main Thing, under different Explanations : as the Papists do the Forgiveness of Sins, through Christ alone, and the Life Everlasting, though they differ from Us in some of the Articles which relate to that Fundamental.

You say next, *That there is nothing truly Controversial, or Disputable, in these Ten Articles, but plain necessary Christian Truths, which every Orthodox Christian may Subscribe, let them vary never so in their Sentiments.* The Bishop of Sarum does Exclude, particularly in the XVIIth Article, the Supralapsarians ; whom you cannot Exclude by your Rule, because in their Opinions there is something truly Controversial, or Disputable, and nothing that destroys the Orthodoxy of Christianity, as you oppose it to Doctrinal Points, of which you had been talking, being Men may hold that Opinion, and yet have a Federal Right in the Covenant of Grace : which shows, that it is not one of the Articles of Faith that the Bishop defines, and which you call Orthodox Christianity. And here you allow a greater Latitude than the Bishop, and that in these Articles, which are not without reason suppos'd to look a particular

way, though not to determine it so, as that a *Remonstrant* need at all scruple the Subscribing to them : as the *Bishop* proves, [pag. 168.]

And since you allow such a Latitude, I wonder you should say, *the Bishop has spent Time and Pains to little purpose*. For no Man can believe *Predestination* as settled in the *Article*, without having *some Opinion* about it or other ; and every one will be glad to see what can be said for all the *Opinions* about it : which will likewise give Light to the General Doctrine. I don't think He could, without this, have answer'd the Ends of an *Expositor*. That Office requir'd him to show upon what Grounds the *Article* stood, what Arguments it had to support it, what *Opinions* it was contrary to, what was to be said for those *Opinions*, and what was to be said for those against them ; which, as they were different, and yet all agreed with the Words of the *Article*, ought to be all explain'd, and the Arguments they were ground'd upon, propos'd ; that Men might be able to chuse for themselves, as the Words had left them a freedom, and be furnish'd with Arguments against those *Opinions* which were contrary to the Words of the *Article*. Besides, it can't be imagin'd, a Man should be so well vers'd in the Proof of the *General Doctrine*, (though these *Articles* have somewhat more than *that*) as to confute its Opposers, without being likewise acquainted with the *particular Opinions* about it, how they are to be defended, what Texts are cited for them, and what against them, the natural Consequences of the *Opinions*, the Advantages or Disadvantages of them to *Religion*. This you must allow to be the Business of an *Exposition* ; except at the same time you'll throw out all the *Expositions* in the World, *Pearson, Barrow, Tower-son*, and all the *Sermons* we have, which may be properly call'd *Expositions* of Scripture.

The Church indeed is silent as to the Quarrel, and cannot be brought into it, without doing it wrong. But since there are such Quarrels, and some of them, as you say, contrary to the Sense of the Church ; all that enter it, should be very well acquainted with the Controversy, so as to be able to Confute those *Opinions* which are contrary to the Determinations of the Church. As to what you say, That the Church has avoided Determining such nice Questions ; it so exactly agrees with what the *Bishop* says about these Disputes, that methinks it would excuse so long a Digression (if the *Bishop's* were one) were it for nothing but to Second the Design of the Church, by trying to put a stop to the unhappy Divisions these Disputes have rais'd. The best and only way to do which, is showing what Charity they owe one another, when they consider the strength of the Arguments on the other Side : For as for compromising the Matter otherwise, there is no hopes.

Lastly : The Moderation of the Church of England is such, &c. Let any One read this Paragraph or two of yours, and, if it be possible, find fault with the *Bishop's Latitude*. There will, you say, be great Scope and Latitude for Diversity of *Opinions* in lesser Matters, and such as are not stated or defined. This is all the *Bishop* desires ; for there cannot be a Grammatical Sense contrary to the Stated

Stated and Defined one. But where the Church thinks fit to dictate and define, there the Children must follow Her. If you mean this against the Bishop, you are mightily out; for you have not once shown that the Bishop has not done so: And if you had, it would have been acting contrary to His own Rule, which is as express as yours.

You repeat again your ways of coming to the knowledge of the Church's Mind; and I repeat my Answer to it, That to Subscribe the Articles in a Sense contrary to any thing Determined in these Explanations, would be Non-sense and Dishonesty. But I must desire you, when you talk of the Church, to leave out that you call the Doctrine of the Church, or Tradition; because by the Doctrines of the Church, I understand only those Doctrines which are required to be Subscribed by every one that Enters; and I don't love to have more put upon me than needs. Those Writings and Practices may be of good Use, but not in the least Obligatory to be believed or followed: And if I think I see reason, I may be quite contrary to them in Opinion, and yet Subscribe, whereas in the other Cases I cannot. But now: Where there is nothing of this, and one Article does not explain another, nor the Article to be Subscribed, explain it self, there we are at liberty, and not bound up to any one Grammatical Sense more than to another: In such Cases, and such only, Men may Subscribe the Articles, and yet be of different Opinions, &c. Now if the Bishop says one word more than this, let me never see what's Sense again. [p. 8. l. 38.] An Article being conceived in such general Words, that it can admit of different Literal and Grammatical Senses, (and that, to be sure, is in such case and such only when 'tis not explain'd by another, or it self) both Sides may Subscribe the Articles with a good Conscience. Then he gives an Example which you allow of, in the next Paragraph; and then says again, [p. 9. l. 21.] Where then the Articles are conceiv'd in general Words, (and that, to be sure, is not when they are any ways determin'd) and have not more special and restrained Terms in them (D'ye mind?) there we may take it as a sure Indication, that the Church does not intend to tie Men up, &c. Now these are the very same things you say: For you allow, there are different Literal and Grammatical Senses, as well as the Bishop; and the Bishop allows, that there are no such, but where the Terms are general, and unrestrain'd, as well as you; and says, they are such as agree with the Purity of Faith: which, if they do, they are what you call things of not that moment, as to come within the express Decisions of the Church, in an Authentick Obligatory way. All the difference is, the Bishop does not mention the other Authentick Obligatory Explanations of the Articles. But this is no difference indeed, for Two good Reasons: 1. Because to talk of a Grammatical Sense of an Article, contrary to an Explanation of it, equally Obligatory with the Articles, is no better than Non-sense; as I have shown before: And, 2. Because if 'twere not Non-sense, 'twould be Dishonesty, to Subscribe in the Articles one thing, and the contrary in another, (the Rubrick, suppose:) which I must do, if I Subscribe the Articles in a Sense different from any Determin'd in that. All that His Lordship is more culpable than

you in, is, that *He* did not make use of a needless Limitation ; which a Man must see, except he be both *Fool* and *Knave* ; and you did, and then make a Flourish with it, as if 'twas all in all —

Therefore you say, *Men may differ about Hell ; that being not defined : only so much is defined, in opposition to the Apollinarian Heresy, as to assert, That Christ had a Soul. This excludes the Bishop's second Sense. That Sense of Hell I have vindicated already : but I can't imagine why you should think that Article was made against the Apollinarians ; when if it be so, 'tis very obscure ; and therefore could not only be intended as an Explanation of the Passage in the Athanasian Creed, which is mightily plainer, and more direct against the Apollinarians, who cannot possibly deny Christ had a Soul, and Subscribe that Creed. And so, you say, Men may differ about those Points grafted upon the Ten Articles, which are not the Transcript of St. Austin's Doctrine, as my Lord suggests, &c. As you have propos'd them, I confess, Men may Subscribe them, and Differ about them, with a witness. If you can prove they are no such Transcript, you'll satisfy a great many honest Men who think they are, and yet think them not so expressly decided, as to Exclude those of the contrary Opinion. Your last Sentence is the old false Accusation, That the Bishop's Latitude warrants Diversity of Opinions in Matters plainly Determined by the Church : which it does not in the least, but just the contrary, in Things only which the Church has left general and undetermin'd.*

And in many Cases (in all that the Bishop intends by his Rule, or has made it to do in his Exposition) the Church has done it ; so that no Rigour can be complain'd of, There's no straining upon the Consciences of Men. Nor do any moderate Men, that I know of, so mistake the Moderation of the Church, as to allow any Remissness in Conformity or Obedience to what it has Determin'd. Their Moderation consists in requiring no more than the Church ; and they are Immoderate Men that require more, and thereby give an occasion for that Distinction of Church-men. To think that the Church intends one thing, and yet thrust our selves upon Her, with a pretence of Subscribing in different Grammatical Senses that the Words will bear, is neither the part of a true Son of the Church of England, nor of an honest Man, as you truly say. And if the Bishop had Allow'd any such thing, I should have said he Abus'd the Church ; as you (who speak such things of Him, as, if you understand plain English, you must know He did not intend, and can't prove that He has practis'd) now do Him.

It is indeed such a Design, to Subscribe to Conditions of Communion, and both Believe and Teach the contrary, that the Bishop could not, upon first Thoughts, approve of it ; and He has been so far from frustrating the Design of the Church, that He has fully prov'd, that the Title of the Articles obliges those that Subscribe them, to do it *ex animo* ; and has Himself, throughout his Exposition, acted according to that Principle : Though you would fain prove that He has not done the last, I believe, contrary to your Opinion ;
because

because you so often, contrary to your *Knowledge*, insinuate that He does not allow *the first*. Since then, to sum up all, you have not prov'd that He does once give occasion to any One to Subscribe with an Opinion that the *Articles* don't allow : Since He gives no Scope for different Opinions, but what the *Articles* admit, and the *King's Declaration* commands : Since you your self hold the very same *Principles of Latitude* that He does, and in *Ten Articles* together countenance a much greater : The *Declaration*, and the *Bishop*, and *You*, must stand and fall together, and either be condemn'd or clear'd of the Accusation of *introducing a Diversity of Opinions*, which the *Articles* were fram'd to avoid. And I believe in my Conscience, *You All* (except as to those *Ten Articles*) stand fully clear of the Imputation.

We have now done with the *First Head*; and if that does not hold, the Two other will necessarily fall of themselves: For it's impossible that any thing should be contrary to the true *Meaning* of the *Articles*, and to other received *Doctrines* of our Church, except there be a Latitude allow'd for *Diversity of Opinions*, which the *Articles* were fram'd to avoid. For, I suppose, all the *Diversity of Opinions* that the *Articles* were framed to avoid, is avoided and excluded in them, otherwise they don't answer their End: And if it is, then nothing can be contrary to the *Meaning* of them, but what introduces an Opinion which they were fram'd to avoid. And, if nothing in the *Exposition* contradicts any *Article*, and consequently any other *Authentic* Explanation of the Church's Mind, there can be nothing that is of dangerous Consequence to the *Lawful Establishment* of the Church, or the Honour of the Reformation: all the *Lawful Establishment* of the Church, and all its Reformation from the Church of Rome, being included and settled in some of these *Authentic* Explanations: And to insinuate by these different Heads, as if there were something more in them, looks like making some New Terms of Communion; and being as much *above* the Church's Moderation, as you complain of Others for being *below* it.

The Second Head of Complaint, is,

That there are many Passages, in the Exposition of several of the Articles, which appear to be contrary to the true Meaning of them, and to other received Doctrines of our Church.

This, it seems, must stay to be prov'd fully, in the particular Examination of the Articles: which, when they come out, we shall know what to say to; but we may give some sort of a guess, by what has been said, what Proof it will admit of. A Man might indeed give a guess, what manner of Proof we should have: And we did naturally expect, according to the Sample you had given, what we have since found to be true, by the Examination of those Two Articles already come out, that what you call Proof, would be nothing but Uncharitable

Uncharitable Insinuations, Unseemly Reflections, mix'd with very little True or Tolerable Reasoning.

You say then, *That whatever is contrary to the Articles, is contrary to the received Doctrine of the Church*: which is certainly true; and then you turn it, *That what is contrary to the received Doctrine, is contrary to the Design at least of some or other of the Articles*. If you mean, by *received Doctrine*, that which is express'd to be so in any other *Explanation of the Church's Mind*; 'tis certainly true, that no One can Subscribe the *Articles* in any Sense different from *that*. But if you mean, in any private Writer, or any number of them; I can't allow it to be the *Doctrine of the Church*: because I think these *Explanations* contain not only the *main Substance*, but *all the Doctrine of the Church*; *all that She* requires any One to believe, that Enters himself into her Body. I wish you would keep to your *Rules of Latitude* in the Account of the *Moderation of the Church of England*: but I see, 'twas nothing but the strength of *Truth*, that wrested those Allowances from you; whenever you come to your self, you forget that *Moderation*, and fix New Terms upon us, which are so far from being *Obligatory*, that they don't in the least belong to us, any farther than we shall think them Reasonable.

You are at it again, in the next Paragraph, and at the Old Trick of telling us the *Church's Ways and Means*. The Three *first* of which you rightly determine *Obligatory*; but the *last* of them (as distinguish'd from the Three former) I am no more *obliged* to consider, than the most distant thing in the World. *Obliged*, I say; for nothing is required more, to denominate me a *True Son of the Church*, than what is necessarily to be Subscribed, and Assented to, for my Entrance into it: and to make any thing more, and to fix it upon Men, before you'll allow them the Name, is making *New Terms of Communion*, which the *Church* does not lay upon us. Nothing is the *Doctrine of the Church*, but what is contained in some of those *Explanations*; and to call such particular Men as are of my Opinion, *the Church*, is only a Trick to vilifie others, who hold all that the *Church* enjoins in any of those Things they Assent to; but in all other Things count themselves as much at liberty to follow *Calvin*, or *Episcopius*, or the worst Man in the World, if they think he speaks *truth*, as *Montague* or *Jewell*, or any the *best Man*. These Impositions are what the *Moderate Men* complain of; and think (though they have as good Opinions of *those Writers* as any Body can have) that They who would fix them upon Men, are not so Moderate as the *Church* is, whose degree of Stiffness they exactly desire to keep to.

As for the Three *first* ways, all *Doctrines and Rules* settled by Them, we are bound to follow and embrace: And I don't think any thing in them so *obscurely express'd*, as that we can't see what's meant by it; and very often, (that is, always where it is so) we can see that 'twas meant, not to fix us to the Opinions of Those that compil'd them, but to leave us to our own Liberty as to the particular Opinion, it not being of any Consequence.

But

But you, on the contrary, make the *received Opinion*, as you call it, the Determination of *that* that is not Determin'd in any thing we Subscribe; whereas the Intent of the *Articles* plainly was to determine only how far we should be obliged to receive the *received Opinion*. The *Articles*, I say, tell us how far we are obliged to follow the *received Opinion*, and not the *received Opinion* in what Sense we are oblig'd to understand the *Article*. This was the Intent of the *Articles*; otherwise it had been as easie to have put down their own Opinion, as the *general Word*: but that was so hard, that when they had done it in One *Article*, 'twas Corrected, and left General. And indeed, you your self (if you were so, when you gave that Account of *Moderation*) acknowledge this by Consequence: For in all those *Ten Articles* you give all a Liberty of Subscribing, so they hold the *Fundamental*; whenas, if this that you call the *Doctrine of the Church* be Obligatory, every One must Subscribe them only with that Opinion which he knew Those who compil'd them had. This is a New Term, I think, of *Communion*, *The Opinion of the Compilers*. And you can mean nothing, by *received Doctrine*, but *that*, distinct from the other Three, as you plainly make it. If you do, tell me what it is, and show me that it is *Obligatory*; and, if it be, how we could ever cast off any General *received Doctrine*, (one of which is as *Obligatory* as another) since that Rejection must be begun by some private Person, who, if he were in the wrong, all that follow'd him were so too; for *Falshood* can never be made *Truth* by the Multitude that pursue it. Our *Articles* never, its plain, were thus stiff, and we desire to be no stiffer than they: Nor do we at the same time think we can *Subscribe* them, and *Declare contrary to them*; because all the Latitude desir'd, and which you grant, is in Things not Determin'd in them. We do not think a Man can Subscribe to the *Grammatical Sense* of an *Article* (which is the *Bishop's Rule*) in such a Sense as to make it contradict it self, or any other *Article*; because Contradictions can never make any Sense at all: And I can scarce think you have so low a Notion of *Grammatical Sense*, as to make none at all of it; though you speak as if you had, when you say here, *that a Man may Subscribe in a Sense, that the Words will bear, according to the Rules of true Grammar, and seemingly proper Signification, and yet suppose at the same time that he may so expound the Article he Subscribes, as to make it contradict it self, or some other Article*. This, in your excellent Notion of *Grammatical Sense*, I say, you think possible: for otherwise you need not have told us 'twas *unreasonable*, because the *Impossibility* it self would have been a sufficient Bar against any Man's doing it.

You generally, when you have a mind to show the ill Use of *Grammatical Sense*, fall upon the *second*, and the word *Hell*: whereas, if you say true, it makes the *Article* speak *Nonsense*; and then, if you thought so, all the fault you could lay to the *Bishop's Charge*, would be, mistaking in the Practice of his own *Rule*. You are upon all Occasions, making this *second Sense* the *Measure* of the *Bishop's Latitude*: whereas *Grammatical Sense* is his

Measure ; and that, if this *second Sense* be *Nonsense*, is contradicted and ruin'd by it. But you play still more foul, when you say, *This seems to be preferred in the Exposition*. Let but any One read the last Paragraph of that *Article*, where *Bishop Pearson's Opinion* is represented, and look in the *Contents* before the *Introduction*, p. xviii. *What may be the true Sense of this Article*, and he cannot but think it *Uncharitable*.

The Running-down the Three Creeds, and Disparaging them, as you call it, is against the *Design* of the *Article*. I am sorry to hear, that speaking *Truth* of the *Creeds*, is *Disparaging* them. For that says, they are *thoroughly to be receiv'd, and believed*. But pray, why does it say so? For they are to be *prov'd from Scripture*. You see, it puts the *Belief* of them upon no other *Foot* ; and that's so sure an one, that it is alone as sufficient as all the other. For except they can be proved so, all the *Antiquity and Authority* of *General Councils*, according to *Article XXI*. would signify nothing : And, if I *Subscribe* that it can, I must firmly believe it, though made but *Yesterday*, as if made a *Thousand Years* ago, or indeed as the *Scripture* it self ; just as I do all the *Articles* I *Subscribe*, with the same firmness that I do the *Creeds*, though in *Point of Antiquity* they differ. If it be true, that the *Athanasian Creed* was never heard of to the *VIIIth Century*, 'twas not the *Meaning* of the *Church* to have it so believ'd. If it were never Confirm'd by any *General Council*, 'twas not the *Meaning* of the *Church* to oblige *Subscribers* to think so. Indeed, the *Church* had no *Meaning* at all about it, and has not spoken the least word concerning it, but has left the *Creeds* upon only the foot of *Scripture* ; but so positively, that no *Man* can *Subscribe* this *Article*, without believing they can be *prov'd from Scripture*. And Those that do not think they can, are not in the least favour'd, by making them have no *Advantage from Antiquity* ; because, whatever *Advantage* they might have from thence, it would not at all affect a *Man* who thought they were not only not to be *proved from Scripture*, but contrary to it, as the *Socinians* do : except you'll say, a *Man* ought to believe *Antiquity*, when it contradicts *Scripture*. These again, I must tell you, are *New Terms of Communion*, making the *Meaning* of the *Articles* to be what is not so much as express'd or mention'd in them ; and the *Meaning* of this particularly to be for the *Antiquity of the Creeds*, and the *Confirmation* of them by *Councils*, though against *Truth* ; when it self does not only not mention any such thing, but rather the contrary, and, as you call it, *Disparages* the *Apostles Creed* it self. We shall have *Things* finely manag'd, when you are to play the *Church*, and make it speak what's your *Will*, even against its own.

You don't here enquire, whether it be so in *Fact* or not : but its a great *Complement* pass'd upon this *Creed*, which does not very well comport with the *Article* which is made in favour of all the *Three Creeds*. How far in favour of them, pray ? As to the *Antiquity*, and this having been Confirm'd by a *General Council* : Not a word of it, but only it says, *They are to be prov'd from Scripture*. If indeed the *Bishop* had said the *Creeds* were not to be *prov'd from Scripture*,
or

or if the *Article* had said they had been confirm'd all by *Councils*, it had been a scurvy *Complement to the Church*: but when the *Bishop* says all that the *Article* does; you do not do well to accuse Him, for not *serving the Church* with a Lye, or for not carefully concealing the Truth, in a thing the *Church* has nothing to do with. It sounds a little odd, to hear a *Church-man* say, The *Question* is not, whether it be true or no; but, whether such a *Complement to the Creeds* be not against the *Article*: as if, supposing it True, it were not to be spoken, because the *Article* will be Affronted by it: which is as much as supposing the *Meaning of the Article* to be False, for you can never prove the thing otherwise than True. Such *Complements* do Men put upon the *Articles*, when they make them have *Meanings* that are not in them; and thereby, against all *Moderation*, make it necessary to Men to Subscribe to their own impos'd false Sense. For if Men are not oblig'd to Subscribe to this *Meaning* that you have put upon the *Article*, then 'tis not the *Meaning of the Article*. You cannot possibly make the Words bear any such *Meaning*, but must super-add it to them: and a Man does all the *Church* can require, when he Subscribes any *Article* according to the Sense express'd in it, not regarding any Additions that you will think fit to make. And since the *Bishop* has prov'd all that the *Article* has express'd, or any One is oblig'd to Subscribe to, I wonder you can say, He has contradicted the *Meaning of the Article*. Pray consider how you deal with the *Bishop* here, where there is not the least Expression in the *Article* that looks like what you call the *Meaning*; and how you deal with Him, about his *Suggestion of the Ten Articles being a Transcript of St. Austin's Doctrines*, in which there are Expressions looking that way; and see how you can make them agree.

You have not in the least shown before, that those *Articles* respect only the *Principal Doctrine*, and have nothing to do with any of the less momentous *Disputes*. You have said it, indeed; but have done nothing to convince any One that thought they look'd to that we call the *Calvinistical Opinion*; nor do very Understanding Men believe you can. We know, that the receiv'd *Doctrine*, when they were made, was so; and that Adventurous *Arminian* that first Subscrib'd them, broke quite through your Fourth Way of coming to the *Church's* Mind: and all that have since follow'd him through the Gap, have, notwithstanding there were no such thing express'd in the *Article*, run quite contrary to the *Church's* *Meaning*, and the received *Doctrine*. 'Tis your own way of Talking in other *Articles*, where there is not the least mention or glimpse of what you call their *Meaning*; and therefore be pleas'd to take it in these *Articles*, where there's somewhat more than bare Appearance of it, and where most Great Men have thought there was so. But I won't dispute the Case with you; they shall be what you'd have, because I am a Friend to as much *Latitude* as can reasonably be allow'd. What will follow? Why then the *Exposition* given us of the *Articles*, which is to revive those *Questions*, cannot but be contrary to the *Design* of these *Articles*: and to bring those things upon the Stage, is but to wrong the Reader, and the *Articles*,

upon which these Speculations are grafted, that do not belong to them. But let me tell you, Those Questions don't want reviving ; they never yet were dead, nor, I doubt, ever will be. Every Body can scarce help having some one or other of those Opinions ; and therefore 'twas no more than due, to show how far the Article would bear any of them, and which it excluded : Though, supposing it was contrary to them all, to set all the Objections in a fair Light, and to give them an Answer, is surely the Work of an Exposition, if our Sermons be such. Much more is it so, when they are all agreeable to the Thing to be Expounded. For, you know, we generally set forth the different Interpretations, and Manners of Explaining the main Head, and on what Grounds the different Parties go, and then, which is most agreeable to the main Design : or, if there be no material difference, (however great ones have been made) show how those different Opinions may be brought nearest together, how they all consist with the main and necessary Head, and how those that hold them ought to bear with one another. This we call an Exposition, and this is all the Bishop has done. You may call it reviving those Disputes, but 'tis just the contrary. For those Disputes are alive, and alive they will be ; and the only way to make them manag'd with Charity, and the Maintainers of them forbear one another in Love, is to set each Opinion in its due Light, and give it its due Strength and Advantages, that each Side may see the other is not despicable. If the Design then of the Church was to have these Disputes either not meddled with, or not made the Causes of Trouble and Disorder ; it ought to be acknowledg'd, that the Design of the Exposition is the very same with it. I don't say, how gloriously it has succeeded ; but you your self can't but acknowledge you have Abus'd the Bishop, when you look upon what He says of His Design. You say, The Exposition is to revive all those Questions. Now, though you cunningly left out, the Design of the Exposition is to do so, that you might have a retiring Hole ; yet you have express'd the same thing, when you say it is to do it : for every One knows the difference between The Exposition revives these Disputes, and, The Exposition is to revive these Disputes. So that this does not excuse you. For see what the Bishop says of His own Design, who knew it best : [pag. VII, VIII. of the Preface.] One Reason, among others, that led me to follow the Method I have pursu'd in this Controversy, is to offer at the best Means I can, for bringing Men to a better understanding of one another — Men whose Opinions are so Different, can never be brought to an Agreement : and the settling on some Equivocal Formularies, will never lay the Contention that has arisen concerning them. The only possible Way of Sound and Lasting Reconciliation, is to possess both Parties with a Sense of the Force of the Arguments that lie on the other Side ; that they may see they are no way contemptible, but are such as may prevail on wise and good Men. Here's a Foundation laid for Charity : And if to this Men would add a just Sense of the Difficulties in their own Side, then it would be more easie to Agree on some general Propositions, &c.

———— Those who Agree about all this, should not Differ, though they can-

not fall into the same Methods of Reconciling these together. And if they do all Agree, to bless God, &c. — — — Here the great Truths on both Sides are safe; every thing that has an Influence on Practice is agreed on, though neither Side meet in the same Ways of joining all these together. You see here, His Design was to Second the Church of England's, in a General Agreement. And surely, by you He might then have been pardon'd, if He had mistook His Way towards it. But I can't help saying, That He has chosen so likely a Method, and pursu'd it so closely, that if the Design of the Church of England was to have Men United in the General, and bear with one another in the Particulars, 'tis accomplish'd as much as it can be: for no One can read these Arguments, set off with so much Strength and Clearness, without not only not insulting the opposite Opinion as Folly, and Irreligion, but almost being ready to Embrace it, at least, without being very Humble and Modest in his own. Nay, I believe 'tis the readiest Way to make Men resolve only to believe the necessary General wherein both Sides are Agreed, and not to trouble their Heads with the Particulars not necessary, wherein they Differ; when they find it a Drawn-Battle, as 'twere, between the Arguments concerning them, and both Sides to have their Advantages, and, I was going to say, unanswerable Difficulties belonging to them. So that, if the Design of the Church of England were to have her Sons believe only the Main Fundamental, and not trouble their Heads with the Disputable Controversial Points; the Bishop has taken the readiest way to cow Men in that unnecessary Pursuit, to check their hot-headed Forwardness, and so to compleat the Design of the Church. Though I must here, at last, desire you to take notice, That it is no One's Opinion, that I know, that all things not touch'd in the Articles, are unlawful to be meddled with, or disputed about; which is all you have to say, why these should not: I am sure, it can't be your Opinion; because you make some things, not express'd in them, to be even necessary. Consider these Things, the Bishop's Design, your Accusation; Repent, and beg Pardon. If you can tell what those Opinions are, contrary to the Articles, for which, you say, a Latitude is encourag'd, I shall know what to say: To a General Accusation, I have nothing to Answer, but a down-right Denial.

That Passage you speak of, is verily in the Exposition; but, I dare say, to prove it inconsistent with the words of the Article, is impossible. What you have done, directly proves the contrary; and, I believe, was altogether owing to Inadvertency. You say then, that the Latin Article is *In Lege*, though the English be *By*, and the English and the Latin were both Sign'd in Convocation: and I'll add, both signifie, to be sure, just the same thing. Now then, *In Lege* often signifies no more than *By the Law*; but *By the Law* never signifies so much as *In Lege*, in its highest and most general Sense. So that if they knew how to construe their own Latin, they meant no more by *In Lege*, than *By the Law*. To put this beyond all possible Dispute; *In* is a much more general word than *By*. If it be taken here in the most

most general and largest sense of it, the *Article* is this ; *They are to be accursed, who say, a Man be saved in the Law he professeth ; whereas there is no Salvation but in the outward Profession of the Christian Religion : for so In Christ*, in the largest sense, signifies. This must be your sense of the *Article*, if you oppose the *Bishop's*, which says all but this. And, supposing this were the *Determined* Sense of the *Article*, I believe every One would Subscribe it, with the same Sense they do the Damnatory Sentence of the *Athanasian Creed*, viz. supposing they had it sufficiently prov'd, and explain'd to them. And with that *Salvo*, the *Article's* nothing more than the *Bishop* says, in that you blame Him for. This is the Consequence, I say, supposing 'twere fully determin'd, to take *In* in the largest Sense : But that is not possible, as the *Article* is now worded ; for though the *Latin* would do it, yet the *English* cannot possibly ; *By* never signifying so much as *In*, in that large Sense : And the *English* and the *Latin* signifying just the same ; the *Latin* must be made to signifie no more than the *English*, because the *English* cannot be made to signifie so much as the *Latin*. So that a particular care is taken, to provide for this difference, by the very Men that compiled the *Articles*, who have determin'd the signification of *In* to be no more than *By*. Nay, supposing the *Article*, both *Latin* and *English*, had been *In*, no reasonable Man would have deny'd that they might signifie no more than *By* ; because in the *Hebrew*, *Greek*, *Latin* and *English* Old and New Testament there is *In* most commonly used, when it can be no more than *By*. The Places are so many, that I won't suppose you ignorant of them, though 'twere more for your Credit to be so. For 'twould make any One blush, to consider that you have abused the *Bishop*, in telling the World, He has taken off the *Anathema* ; when He has given it the fullest Sense *By* is capable of : and you have laid an *Anathema* upon all that believe that Sense ; making the Belief to be determin'd by the *Article*, as necessary to Salvation : which it's impossible the Words should bear ; and which if they would bear, would not at all exclude *this* ; because the very same Words will very often bear both, as taken in a general, and in a restrain'd Sense.

Your next Paragraph is of a Piece with this. I can indeed scarce believe that you think the *Bishop* meant, by *Magisterial Stiffness*, any One's *insisting upon Episcopal Orders, in opposition to other Constitutions*. He blames not their Opinion who think them necessary, any farther than as they abuse others, as not being of the *Church of England*, who have thoughts that other *Ordination* is Lawful abroad ; and thereby *Dictate Magisterially*, in laying that upon us as a necessary Interpretation of the *Article*, which the *Article* it self is not so stiff as to determine, or oblige its Subscribers to believe. But it lets in none but such as believe *Episcopal Ordination* necessary to an Admittance into Our Church ; nor does the *Exposition* of it : and therefore you imagine for the *Bishop*, when you make Him think that it leaves Room for *Presbytery, or Independency*. He never was so particular ; and they must be
very

very easie, who are persuaded to believe that He has manag'd the *Article* so as to make it leave such Room, and speak against it self. 'Tis but a Man's looking upon the *Exposition*, [p. 258. l. 25.] and his own Eyes will convince him that you had none, or none of something that's better. I have shewn this before, when you spoke of this *Article*.

The XXVth *Article* is of *Baptism*: And there the *Bishop* says, *There is no express Rule, or Precept, for the Baptism of Infants*. This, you say, plainly contradicts the *Article* it self. The *Article* then, it seems, says, *There is an express Rule, or Precept*. I'm sure, it does not expressly say so. But let's hear you prove this. You say, *Though the English, is most agreeable, yet the Latine, Optimè congruat, takes off the Ambiguity*. Can't I very fairly say, *There is no express Law in England for such or such a thing; but yet say, That it is as agreeable as is possible to the express Law*. But farther: First of all, This *Congruat* is in the *Subjunctive* Mood; and I believe that is not near so Affirmative as the *Indicative*: And then your Sense of *Optimè* is a little too strict for that of the *Superlative*: And, 3dly. The very word *Congruat*, which signifies no more than that it is agreeable to the *Institution*, seems to suppose that 'tis not the very *express Institution* it self. But to wave this — The *Bishop*, I think, plainly shews, that he means no more by *express*, than that *Infant Baptism* is not in terms, in so many words, declared and commanded in *Scripture*: And I'll tell you why I believe so; 1st. Because in this *Article*, though He says 'tis no *express Rule*, yet He proves that 'tis agreeable to the *Institution of Christ*. And therefore when you prove that because 'tis agreeable to the *Institution of Christ*, it is an *Express Rule*; you say no more than the *Bishop*, and only quarrel about the word *Express*. And, 2dly. Because in the *Article of Oaths*, He says the *Command seems to be Express against Any*, and yet proves them to be Lawful; In both these places He makes *Express* signifie no more than that they are, or are not, in so many words, commanded or allowed: and He fully shews He does not mean what you do by *Express*, because He says the *Rule* is not *Express*, (that is, in his Sense) and yet proves that *Baptism* is agreeable to the *Institution of Christ*, (which, in your Sense, is *express*.)

There may, you say, be an *express Rule, or Precept*, where there are not *express Words* for every *Individual Person* concern'd in the *Institution*. According to the *Bishop's* Sense of *Express*, there cannot; nor indeed, in any good Sense. That, I suppose, which comes by *Deduction* and *Inference*, is not *Express*: for, were it so, 'twould be deduc'd from it self. The nearer the *Deduction* is, so much the nearer *Express* is the Thing proved by it. I am very willing to admit, that the *Rule* for *Womens Receiving* the *Sacrament* is *Express*; because 'tis, at first sight, without any *Deduction*, as palpable as the *Mens*; for which the *Institution* is not a whit more *Express* than for the *Womens*. But the Case in *Baptism* is quite otherwise. Here there is a long, and very hard, and no despicable *Dispute* against the *Capacity* of
Infants

Infants to be Baptized. The Institution is as much pleaded to be against *them* by the *Anabaptists*, as by the *Quakers* the other about *Oaths* is against *us*. Repentance, and Faith, are made necessary to it; and Teaching, necessary to their being acquainted with the Nature of that Repentance, and Faith, and so being made Disciples by *Baptism*: These are in the words of the *Institution*; and from them they argue for the *express* Institution on their Side. Now, notwithstanding this, We argue, That the Institution does not Exclude them, but that they are *capable of Receiving Baptism*, by reason of their *Believing Parents*; and to be admitted, upon their Account, into a *Covenant of Grace*, as in *Circumcision*: and these Arguments show that the Institution is not *Express*. If the Institution be *Express* to all that are capable to Receive, and there are no Degrees of that Capacity; then to All, that are not wholly incapable, the Institution is as necessary as to Any. This is a pretty hard Saying, as to *Baptism* it self, considering the different Capacities of Infants, and Grown Men. But, as to Infant Communion, let me ask you; Were Infants capable of Receiving it, or not? If they were not; then they, who by their Father's Right, might be admitted into a *Covenant of Grace* by one Sacrament, were incapable of receiving any Grace in their Right by another, from which *they are no where in the Gospel excepted or excluded*. And then the *Church* which admitted them, and those honest Men who defended that Admittance, were not only in an Errour, but in a great and heinous *Crime*, in not distinguishing the Lord's Body, for those who were not able to distinguish it themselves. If they were capable, then its absolutely necessary they still should be admitted; because there is an *Express Rule, or Precept*, for the Admittance of all those who are capable of being so. The Parallel might be run much farther. I do it not, I'll assure you, to bring *Infant Baptism* and *Infant Communion* upon the Level; I am far from doing this: but I did it, only to show that there are different Degrees of Capacity, and that Things may be necessary to *some* in an Institution, which are not *absolutely necessary* for *others*, for whom nevertheless they are extremely reasonable and convenient. Though if all I have said be false, yet you your self have prov'd for the *Bishop*, that He has made the Institution *Express* for Infant Baptism. For you say, that, according to the *Article*, there is an *Express Rule, or Precept*, for every thing that is according to Christ's Institution. Now the *Bishop* has prov'd *Infant Baptism* [p. 305, 306.] to be according to Christ's Institution; therefore He has prov'd it, according to you, *Express*. When you knew He had done this, you should have never quarrell'd with Him about the Word, when you both agree in the Thing; but have suppos'd that He meant only, *Infants* were not named in *express Words*.

The foregoing Instances then prove nothing of the Matter you talk of: nor, if they did contradict the Sense you speak of, would they at all contradict *That contained in the Articles*; because you have put Things as contain'd there, which are not. How you prove That that's *more easie*, we come

come now to see : only I must except against the *common received Doctrines* being at all Obligatory. You can't name one, in which there are not different Opinions among equally good Church-men : and those that we call now *received Doctrines*, were perhaps once not so, but others, from which private Men, who had no Authority so to do, if they were Obligatory, took the liberty to depart, and many have follow'd them. What moreover shall be the Standard of *received Doctrine* ? What will be sufficient to give any Doctrine this Title ? And who shall be the Judge in so uncertain a Matter, as whether the Doctrine comes up to the Standard ? For my part, I count all Doctrines and Opinions free for me, which are not fix'd in some *Authenticall Explanations* : and, if you can tell me any that are not so, and yet necessary, I will fairly confess I am out in my Assertion, and the Church in Her Design in imposing the Subscriptions. This Opinion of yours, I think, leaves every Man to be a Judge, who's a *Church of England-man*, according to his own Notion of the *reception* of an Opinion : and if he have confidence enough to say any thing is so received, the Man shall be declar'd what he will. This is the reason, I suppose, you say it's *more easie* to prove this ; because indeed nothing can be easier than to find a Man tripping, in so uncertain and loose a thing as *received Opinion* ; and nothing safer for the Accuser, who can lie cover'd under the Protection of his own Confidence. The Doctrines of the Church are fix'd and certain, and easie to be known by any One that will but look into the *Articles, Homilies, Common-Prayer-Book, and Canons* : and since some of these, though Subscrib'd to, are but in *some sort*, or in *some measure*, binding ; it's very hard, to have things put upon us as *necessary*, which we never Subscribe to, and which we may very honestly never Know.

But however, let us try your *Specimen* ; and I doubt we shall find you *apply'd your self to the Examination of the Book* with a very great degree of Malice, and a very small one of *Attention*.

The XXVIIIth *Article* is concerning the *Lord's Supper* : and you count up all you can find, to make a Mystery in it ; when, I must confess, I think it very plain and simple. All the Mystery can be in it, is the Manner of the Conveyance of the Grace ; and with *that* we have nothing to do. But the *Communion-Service* calls it a *Mystery*. The *Communion-Service* says thus ; *It is my Duty to Exhort you in the mean time, to consider the Dignity of that Holy Mystery, and the great peril of the unworthy Receiving thereof.* We are said here to *receive the Mystery*, and to receive it too sometimes *unworthily*. What can be meant by *Mystery*, but the Bread and Wine ? I wonder you did not bring the other two places in the Communion Service ; *He hath instituted and ordained Holy Mysteries, as Pledges of his Love — Who have duly received these Holy Mysteries —* Then you might have proved something like, that there were no less than *Two Mysteries* in the Holy Sacrament. *We are made by it, in a Spiritual manner, to eat the Flesh of Christ, and*
G
drink

drink his Blood. So says the Bishop, [p. 312.] *Since Eternal Life does always follow the Eating of Christ's Flesh, and Drinking his Blood, and cannot be had without it ; then this must be meant of an Internal and Spiritual Feeding on him : and both before and after, for a Page or two together.* *The Spiritual Nourishment, you say, we receive from it, is compar'd to the Natural Recruit our Bodies have from Bread and Wine.* So says the Bishop, [p. 315.] *The Nourishment which the Types, the Bread and Wine, give the Body, are answer'd in the Effects that the Thing signify'd by them has upon the Soul.* You say again : *Our Catechism tells us, That the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the Faithful in the Lord's Supper.* So does the Bishop, [p. 312.] *There is somewhat Emphatical in these words, My Flesh is Meat indeed ; since the word Indeed, is not added in vain, but to give weight to the Expression.* And [p. 317.] *We assert a real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ.* You go on ; *We are there told of an extraordinary Spiritual Efficacy : There is an Inward Spiritual Grace ; and that to Eat of the Sacramental Bread, and Drink of the Cup, is as the Means, whereby we receive the same, and the Pledge to assure us thereof.* So says the Bishop, [p. 268, 269.] *A Sacrament is an Institution of Christ, in which some material thing is sanctify'd by the Use of some Form of Words, in and by which, Federal Acts of Religion do pass on both Sides ; on ours, by Scrupulations, and Professions, or Vows ; and on God's, by his secret Assistances.* He calls them, three Lines after, *Federal Acts, to which a Conveyance of Divine Grace is tied : and then, in applying this to the Lord's Supper, [p. 270.] It is also the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, that is, the Conveyance of the Blessings of our Partnership in the Effects of the Death of Christ.* And [p. 317.] *All Christians, who receive this Sacrament worthily, have, by their so doing, a share in That which is represented by it, the Death of Christ, and the Expiation and other Benefits that follow it.* After you have seen all this, I can't imagine what you'll say, for thus shamefully mis-representing the Bishop ; whose Expressions, though they mayn't reach *Consubstantiation*, or the Doctrines of some Churches, or some Figurative Expressions of the Fathers, yet they fully come up to what our Church says, I am very sure, and, I believe, to far the major part of our Writers. *The Body of Christ, says the Article, is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an Heavenly and Spiritual manner :* And if the *Exposition*, for two Pages together, does not prove that, and in all the whole Explanation of the Sacrament say as much, I have no Eyes. How can you then say, that when we come to the *Exposition* we don't find it so ? No Mystery indeed we find : No more is there any in all this, and you have not told us one bit where it lies, nor the Texts that prove it to be so, but only say 'tis. I doubt not, a Man may have such a Notion of those Texts, and these Expressions, as are not a *Mystery*, but next door to *Nonsense* : and when he has confounded himself by making them intelligible to his own mind, and others by trying to explain them to them, he has nothing to do but to say it's a *Mystery*, and order us to

to submit our Understandings, when there's no need at all of it ; the Texts being plain, and the Doctrine intelligible, if we go the right way to work. As for those words you bring out of pag. 314. they are spoken against *Transubstantiation* and *Consubstantiation*, and in Justification of our Doctrine : and we must have expected somewhat more of it in the Scriptures, had there been any such thing. Tell us those Expressions you speak of in the Scriptures, and I shall know what to say ; for I think, as yet, 'tis unfolded to every Body's Mind that will consider, and in such manner as to make it no *Mystery*.

You need not therefore have spent your next two Paragraphs. By the first, I can make any hard Text, that is not any where else explain'd, a *Mystery*. By the second, I'll defend it as necessary to be believ'd. It requires nothing but Fancy, and Resolution. What are to be believed as *Mysteries*, are, I think, all of them fully and plainly revealed in Scripture, as necessary to be believed ; though they are not explain'd, nor do I think can be, as our Understandings now are : and we are no farther engag'd to believe any thing of them, than as it is revealed. When a thing is revealed plainly to be, and I can't apprehend how it can be, nor is it reveal'd how ; here I am to submit my Understanding : but when a thing is not only reveal'd, but often explain'd, and I can make a fair, intelligible, plain sense both of the thing it self, and all reveal'd about it, I cannot see any thing to submit my Understanding to ; except you would have me set about making as many *Mysteries* as I can, where there's no need. If you'll show me any thing reveal'd of the Lord's Supper, which I cannot, without any stress to the words, fairly explain, and make intelligible, I will believe it a *Mystery* ; till then, you and I must differ.

You now give us the Bishop's Account of the Institution : which is very true, and to the same purpose with that the Church gives over and over again. 'Tis as much as our *Catechism* says ; and no more than our *Communion Service* three or four times, and particularly in the very Prayer of the Consecrating of the Elements. All this, you say, is very well, but this is far from being all that our Church makes us to understand by this Institution. Yes, sure, here's a full Account of the Institution, though not of the Grace subsequent upon the Worthy Receiving according to it. A Man may Prophane this Institution, or a Man may Receive according to the full Design of it ; and upon these follow the Benefits or Damages which the Bishop speaks of, in the page and half following the words you quote. When you ask therefore, **What becomes of the strengthening and refreshing of the Soul by the Body and Blood of Christ ?** Look afterwards upon the Benefits of Worthy Receiving, and there he says, *The Nourishment which the Bread and Wine give the Body, are answer'd in the Effects that the Body and Blood of Christ have upon the Soul. Where is the Receiving the Body and Blood of Christ, as the inward part of thing signified by the Bread and Wine, over and above the Remembrance ?* All the whole 316th and 317th Pages are spent upon Explaining the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ ; and his

Conclusion is, *We assert a Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ ; but not of his Body, as it is now glorified in Heaven, but of his Body as it was broken on the Cross.*

The Bishop then no where opposes the Doctrine of the Church of England : He says as much as comes up fully to the *Article*, or the *Catechism*. The *Catechism* is express indeed for Receiving the Body and Blood of Christ Spiritually, and by Faith : and so is the Bishop, in his Explanation of the Discourse of Our Saviour's, and in this of the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ. And if you would have pleas'd to look back upon His *Article* of the Sacraments, you would have found He had no such low Notions of a Sacrament, [p. 268.] The other Extreme that we likewise avoid, is that, of sinking the Sacraments so low, as to be mere Rites or Ceremonies — The Phrase, **Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ**, is above the nature of an Anniversary, or Memorial-Feast. (You see, here's something over and above the continual Remembrance.) This Opinion, we think, is very unsuitable to those high Expressions : And we do not doubt (Pray observe, and blush) but that Christ who Instituted those Sacraments, does still accompany them with a particular Presence in them, and a Blessing upon them ; and Worthily Receiving, we do certainly Receive in them particular Largesses of the Favour and Bounty of God. They are not bare and naked Remembrances and Tokens (What have you to say for your self?) but are actuated and animated by a Divine Blessing that attends upon them. And p. 270. In the Lord's Supper there is Bread and Wine for the Matter. The giving it to be eat and drunk, with the words that Our Saviour used in the First Supper, are the Form. Do this in Remembrance of me, is the Institution. Ye shew forth the Lord's Death, till he come, is the Federal Act on our part. It is also the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, (what the Catechism calls **Verily and indeed taking and receiving the Body and Blood of Christ** ; and what the Communion calls *Spiritually eating the Flesh of Christ, and drinking his Blood* ; what the Article calls *After a Heavenly and Spiritual Manner* ; what the Church means by *real Presence*, or all that is meant by these Expressions, is fully answer'd in) the Conveyance of the Blessings of our Partnership in the Effects of the Death of Christ. I cannot Comment upon these words ; they are so express against your Accusation of the Bishop, that I shall leave Men to their Eyes, and you to your Conscience. A Man's Reputation is a serious thing, and so is Truth ; and you must, except you repent of these plain and open Neglects of them both, make, in the Great Day, a terrible Recompence to them. And as for your own sake, and the Honour of the Gospel of Truth, which you take in your Mouth ; so for my own sake also, I wish you had shewn more Respect to Truth, that there might not be that Disadvantage in Opposing : For it's a sort of a prejudice against me, that I am forc'd to tell you, You're in the Wrong, oftener than the most ill-natur'd People are willing to think any One can be.

Let us now come to the *Power of the KEYS*, as to *Binding*, and *Loosing*, the Nature of *Excommunication*, and *Absolution*, and see how the *Bishop* has made it fall short of its due *Efficacy*; and whether He advances *Interpretations of Scripture*, which do by no means come up to the *Doctrine of the Church*. These *Interpretations* are to be met with under another *Article*. If He have prov'd this *Article* to be true, it is all the *Church* requires; though He have not done it by these *Texts*, but by other *Texts*, and *Sound Reason*. It is very pleasant, that we must not only believe such a thing, but believe it upon such a particular *Text*. You make the *Church* humourfome, which will have its *Doctrines* not only prov'd, but prov'd in such a *Way*, and by such *Texts*. If the *Bishop* have fully prov'd this *Power*, as strongly as you can; what matters it, if He prove it not by a *Text*, which, to a *Considering Man*, may fairly be deny'd primarily to belong to it, and was never appropriated by the *Church* to it? But your *Way* is, never to take notice of what the *Bishop* has said, be it never so much in Defence of the *Doctrine of the Church* in its true Bounds: but if he rejects any thing, either as questionable, or trifling, which you have look'd upon as an *Argument* for it, you catch at that, as if 'twas the only thing the *Doctrine* depended upon. You have done this so often, and so home, as to give the *Enemies of the Church* a vast Advantage, in thinking its *Doctrines* are so slightly grounded: And if you think they are not so, you should not abuse the *Bishop*, for passing by one *Argument* as not substantial, and sure, and undoubted, when at the same time He proves the *Doctrine* by unanswerable, and indisputably true ones. But rather than the *Bishop* shall not be ill handled, you'll do the *Church* a Mischief: which is like opposing the Rights and Privileges of the *Episcopal Order*, only in opposition to the *Persons* Vested with it.

You give us the XXXIII^d *Article*, and then say, *From hence we must needs conclude, that the Compilers had Our Saviour's Expression before them*. Well; suppose they had, and suppose I were sure they had, might not I, for all that, think that they had not a right *Interpretation of the Text*, as it stands in the Bible; though, as it is here, I could not deny it to be true; for words spoken upon one occasion, may be applied to another. To put it in a Case that you cannot, I think, deny — The *Article*, you know, about *Hell*, was determin'd: *His Spirit which he gave up, was with the Spirits which were detain'd in Prison, that is, in Hell, and preach'd to them, as the Place in St. Peter testifieth*. This last Expression determines the *Interpretation of that Place of Scripture* to this sense: But supposing the last words, *as the Place in St. Peter testifieth*, were left out; and supposing my Opinion were, that *Christ's Soul* was in *Hell*, the Place of Torment, and preach'd to the *Spirits* there; Might not I, notwithstanding I saw the *Church* had its Eye upon this *Text*, honestly Subscribe the *Article*, where I see, by *Prison*, is meant no more than *Hell*, and yet think that the *Text* had a much properer, and more pertinent Signification? Or will you, who have Subscrib'd to the General *Doctrine of the Homilies*, pretend to stand by the *Interpretation of every Text* in them

as the most proper? If you will not, you come under the *Bishop's* Accusation, *That you make the Compilers of them not really understand them.* This is the Answer I should give you, supposing the *Bishop* had such Notions of that *Text* as you make Him, different from what you make the *Article*, by reason of a couple of words borrow'd from it: because the *Text* may be very true (and so honestly Subscrib'd to) though not truly interpreted. But, I must tell you, you have mis-represented the *Bishop*, who has no such low Notions of it, as to confine it to mere private Quarrels, but makes it an Argument, *à minori*, against publick Stubbornness and Offences. Before I begin, I must take notice of one thing, and that is, That you your self have made the *Article* mis-interpret the *Text*, and shown, that the *Compilers* did not really understand it. You find fault with the *Bishop*, for putting such a Construction upon the Words as implies, that the being shunn'd as a Heathen, and a Publican, is not to be look'd upon as the Effect or Consequence of Excommunication, but antecedent thereto: whereas the *Article* makes it consequent. Now if the *Text* makes it Antecedent, you will, I hope, suppose that the *Compilers*, though they had it before their Eye, yet did not design this as the Sense of it, lest you should be guilty of that great Crime of thinking the *Compilers* did not understand the *Text*. The *Text* is this; *If he neglect to hear the Church, let him be as a Heathen Man, and a Publican.* Here, you see, his being accounted a Heathen Man, and a Publican, follows immediately upon his not hearing the Church. Now I suppose you will not say, that neglecting to hear the Church, and being Excommunicated, is the same thing. Therefore, his being accounted a Heathen, and a Publican, is in the *Text* antecedent to Excommunication, or at least not consequent, as it is in the *Article*. Then you give us the *Bishop's* Words, and make this Comment upon him, *That here's sending them to Temporal Courts.* And don't you know, that Excommunication in the Church would be nothing regarded, were it not for delivering Men up to the Civil Power? And is it not the Way that the Church it self takes to enforce its Excommunications? though the *Bishop's* Discourse there is about Prosecutions on Private Offences. And I suppose here's somewhat more meant by the Body or Assembly to which they are united, than a few Neighbours met in a Vestry, or Common-Hall; because the Punishment ensuing upon being Refractory, and not Hearing that Assembly, is Excommunication, and forfeiting That that's due to Christians. This is a Punishment that you can't think the *Bishop* will allow to be due, upon not hearing a few Neighbours: and if you are resolved to have it so, that the *Bishop*, upon such an account as you have framed for Him, allows such terrible Punishments, you can never complain, sure, of his not allowing sufficient Power to the Church, when He allows so much to a few Private Men, as you strangely imagine He does. There is some Notice then taken of *Tell it to the Church*, even so much as to have Excommunication follow upon being Refractory. But this Exposition, you say, is set off with such Assurance, as scarce to allow the *Text* to be capable of any other Interpretation. The *Bishop's* words are these; This

Exposition

Exposition does so fully agree to the *Occasion* and *Scope* of the *Words*, that there's no colour of *Reason* to carry them farther. This the *Bishop* says, in Answering the *Papists* Texts they cite for *Infallibility*, one of which is this, *Tell it to the Church*; and if he refuses to *Hear the Church*, let him be as a *Heathen Man*, and a *Publican*: He says, this refers to *Private Differences*, which *Our Saviour* is speaking of, and there's no colour of *Reason* to carry it farther; that is (as any Man that did not read things with a settled Resolution of finding as many Faults as he could, would imagine) to no other Matters but such as concern the Peace and Quiet of the Members of that *Body*, or *Assembly*: And therefore the *Roman Catholicks* have no colour of *Reason* to apply them to every thing that the *Church* Determines, so as to pronounce Men *Heathens*, and *Publicans*, that don't believe it. And if you had look'd into pag. 367. you would have seen this; for there the *Bishop* carries that Text so far (though not in Matters of Faith, yet in Matters of Publick Peace) as to make such as despise the Obligations to that Peace, and Order, to be well look'd on as *Heathens*, and *Publicans*. Though, says he, these words of *Our Saviour*, of Telling the *Church*, may perhaps not be so strictly applicable to this Matter in their Primary Sense, as *Our Saviour* first spake them; yet the Nature of Things, and the Parity of Reason, may well lead us to conclude, That though those words did immediately relate to the Composing of *Private Differences*, and of Delating intractable Persons to the *Synagogues*, yet they may be well extended to all those Publick Offences which are *Injuries* to the *Whole Body*; and may be now applied to the *Christian Church*, and to the *Pastors* and *Guides* of it, though they related to the *Synagogue* when they were first spoken.

Thus then, you see, He has shown, that they may fairly be carry'd farther; though he had, in the *Exposition*, before carry'd them so far, as to assert an *Extraordinary Power* lodg'd in the *Church*, upon such *Extraordinary Occasions*; and, by *Parity of Reason*, prov'd a Necessity of Preserving the Peace and Quiet of the *Church* on All. And there's no Reason at all to think that the *Church* any otherwise thought this Text belong'd to it, than by such a *Parity*: And if the *Parity* be prov'd, as it easily may, the Text sufficiently belongs to it, and proves its Authority. And that Authority of *Excommunicating*, the *Bishop* proves to belong to the *Church*, by other express Texts, in as high a Sense as the *Church* any where Claims it, or can with Reason do so; and by Arguments naturally arising from the Constitutions of all Societies whatsoever. Nor does the Connexion which you speak of in the former Paragraph, and repeat in this, at all prove that this Text in its Primary Signification, or any otherwise than by *Parity of Reason*, imports as much as you would have it. For we very well know that *Our Saviour* takes occasion from any particular Matter of Fact, to give a general Charge to his Disciples, arising naturally from that Matter of Fact; but not at all obliging us to give as general a Signification to the *Occasion*, as to the Charge. So here, all before may relate to *Private Differences*, and the Power of the *Jewish Synagogues* in them; and this, *Whatsoever ye shall bind, &c.* may

may be a general Declaration of the Disciples Authority in the Christian Church, which naturally arose from what he had been talking about the Jewish.

What you say next, is true, *The Church has a Power of Remitting and Retaining Sins, upon certain Conditions*: This is call'd, *The Power of the Keys*. The Nature of this Power, and how far the Apostles Commission belongs to us, has been a Dispute between the Church of Rome and Us; and amongst equally good Church-men there are different Opinions. None, I think, will venture to claim the same Power with the Apostles, because we cannot now pretend to the same Discerning of Spirits. By that Knowledge, they were always assur'd that their Determinations should not clash with any thing ratified in Heaven: but Ours, we must confess may, and doubtless often do. Whether we Excommunicate or Absolve or no, whether we Bind or Loose, or whatever we do, all is the same in Heaven. An innocent Person is there innocent, however here declared; and a Sinner there, a Sinner, however here connived at, and suffer'd. All therefore that our Absolutions can mean and reach to, is the present Comfort of true Repenters, and the Restoring them to the Privileges of the Society, if they have been Excommunicated; as our Excommunications serve only to the Preservation of the Society, the Shaming of Sinners, and by that bringing them to Repentance. For none can know, in many Cases, whether they be ratify'd in Heaven, but the Person on whom they fall; and therefore they are to be warily us'd, not always indeed, but never indeed insulted, and abus'd. All this depends upon the Nature of a Society; and, supposing Christ had, in all his Commissions, given only an Authority to his Apostles to settle Laws in his Church, is included therein: because Penalties, and the Relaxation of them, must belong to the Governours of every Society: And where the Laws are Spiritual, the Enforcements of them are so too properly; though, to make them regarded, the Civil Power is, necessarily almost, call'd in. This Doctrine then may be founded upon Texts of Scripture, where 'tis not express'd, but only by Consequence implied: And *He* that gives such an Interpretation of those Texts as necessarily supposes that Consequence, does by no means destroy or weaken the Proofs the Church has of its Doctrine; but you rather, who imply as if they were all the Texts it has to prove it by. *The Commission* doubtless was such as was in a manner confin'd to the Apostles; for you your self cannot deny, that in a manner only it is applicable to us, viz. So far as we act according to those Laws and Conditions that Our Saviour, or His Apostles, by Virtue of His Commission, Enacted and Settled. If we Act under such due Limitations, we Bind, and Loose; but 'tis only in such things as would have been equally Bound and Loosed in Heaven, without our Declaration: If we Act contrary to them, Things remain as they were there, notwithstanding our Acting. Why therefore we should be fond of forcing a Text to prove a needless thing (in all Cases but those I mention'd before, which are prov'd by the Nature of the Society, and the Orders, and Practice

Practice of the Apostles) I can't imagine. If this Text be, by the *Bishop*, made to extend to giving Laws to the Christian Church, and He Himself prove, by the Practice, and Express Orders of the Apostles, that they did, upon this Commission, give Laws to the *Church* for all those Purposes, which you bring this Text to maintain; I can't tell what you can desire more. And this He does, as you may see in these words of this Explanation of that Text, *He Authoriz'd them to give other Laws to the Christian Church*: And in the XXXIII^d Article He shows where they have given such Laws, and the necessary Reason they are founded upon.

The sense He gives then of these words is *clear*, so that any One may understand it, and such an one, as, joined with the Apostles Practice, and Orders, *continues down the Power of Binding and Loosing to us*, in as high a degree as the *Church* lays Claim to. Though, if it did not, I think every Man's at liberty to interpret a Text as he sees most reason, when it is no where determined by the *Church*, though it have been all along brought to prove the Doctrine of the *Church*, which he allows upon other good Reasons, but does not think depends upon that Text. This were justifiable, were it the *Bishop's* Case; but, I presume, this is not so. For, *Dispensing the Gospel, and giving Laws to the Christian Church*, (which you fairly leave out in this Paragraph) will amount to as much as what you bring this Text to confirm, when back'd with the Apostles Practice upon this Commission, and St. Paul's Command to *Timothy* and *Titus*, &c. You bring this Text upon the Level with that in St. *John*. Whether it be so or no, or whether that be not, in a manner, confin'd to the Apostles, or whether that signifie any more than the *Bishop* has made this, are Questions that you have no where satisfy'd.

This Text, of *Retaining Sins*, &c. you say, *has been always understood to extend to a Relaxation of Ecclesiastical Censures*. If you'll yield the Text, and compound for the Thing, I'll promise you the *Bishop* shall allow such a Power in the *Church*: because He allows the Power of *Ecclesiastical Censures to be not only Lawful, but Necessary, upon several Considerations*: And the same Power that can Lay on, to be sure, can Take off. Nay, supposing this Text to be the same with that of *Binding and Loosing*, He will allow it from this Text. For though you say, that *this Relaxation comes to somewhat more than Introducing New Laws under the Gospel Dispensation, in the room of those Dissolv'd*; I know not how you'll prove it: because the Power of Laying on Punishments, and the Relaxation of them, is a Necessary Consequent of a Society; and whoever have Power given them to Make Laws, for the Regulation of any Society, have Power thereby to Censure and Absolve, to *Bind and Loose*, to *Retain and Remit*. But this is not the main of the Accusation: *The Church of England it self has carry'd this Text farther, in the Form of Ordination*.

You give us thereupon the Words our *Church* uses, and they are the very words of Scripture, without any Comment upon them, or Sense given of them. We must therefore suppose the Sense of the *Church*, in them, to be such as is consistent with the Power it allows to Those to whom they are

H

spoken;

spoken ; and gather its meaning, from the Power it gives by Them to every single Presbyter. These words are pronounced to every such : The Power the *Church* thinks given by Them, is given to every such. If therefore the *Church*, by the Form of *Ordination*, has carry'd the Words to signifie and confer a Power of Censuring, and Relaxing (and that is the least you make of them) then the *Church*, by the Form of *Ordination*, confers a Power of Censuring, and Relaxing, on every single Presbyter. This, you know, it does not, but only a Power of Declaring what the Governours of the *Church* Order. And might not I, from hence, with much more Reason than you, argue, That the *Church* did not think this Text the Support of its Authority, but other Texts, and solid Reasons ; since it no where applies it to it self, but to those only to whom it allows no such Authority as you plead for from this Text. However, I'll promise to give the same Extent to the latter part of it, that you will to the former, *Receive ye the Holy Ghost* : and they must go together, one being the foundation of the other.

You bring this Quotation out of the *Ordination* Form, to prove, that the *Church* don't mean only, Preaching the Word, by that Text. I don't know who says it does. There's some difference, sure, between *Dispensing the Gospel, Dissolving the Obligation of the Mosaical Law, and giving other Laws to the Christian Church*, and bare *Preaching the Word*, which every single Presbyter has Authority given him to do, and something more. 'Tis the former of these, which the *Bishop* says is the sense of *Binding*, and *Loosing* ; and consequently, if they signifie the same, of *Retaining*, and *Remitting*. Indeed, the two last parts of that Authority belong not to us, but were confined to the Apostles ; but we may, from that Power committed unto them, claim a Power to Act according to the Orders and Laws the Apostles settled in the *Church*, in pursuance of the Commission given them in those Texts, which immediately belong'd, and were, in a manner, confin'd to them : and it is upon those Laws, and Orders, that the *Bishop*, in the XXXIId Article, founds our Power. Your whole Argument upon this Matter runs thus — The Text of *Retaining* and *Remitting Sins*, is of the same import with that of *Binding* and *Loosing*. Now the Text of *Retaining* and *Remitting Sins*, has been all along suppos'd, and is, by the *Church of England*, made to signifie more than *Preaching the Word* : And consequently the *Bishop*, when He gives such a Sense of *Binding* and *Loosing*, as was, in a manner, confin'd to the Apostles, and gives us no Power but that of *Preaching the Word*, gives such a sense of *Binding* and *Loosing*, as is inconsistent with that which the *Church* gives of *Retaining* and *Remitting*. I think this is the full force of your Argument : And to this I Answer, 1. That the *Church* no where supposes they are the same ; and your Proofs that they are, may be very well doubted. 2. That supposing they are, the *Bishop's* Sense of *Binding* and *Loosing*, join'd with the Practice of the Apostles, gives the *Church* a greater Power than it any where claims from the Text of *Retaining* and *Remitting*. 3. That both these

these Texts were, in a manner, confin'd to the Apostles; and all we can pretend for applying them to *us*, is our acting according to the Laws settled by Them, upon the Commission given Them in these Texts. And, 4. That the *Church* no where applies any of them to Her Self, but to single *Presbyters*; and Her Power is sufficiently proved by other undeniable Arguments, if any One should be so bold as to say these prove it not. And, 5. That the *Church* only uses the bare Words of Scripture, and puts no Interpretation upon them; and we are at as much liberty in our putting what we think the best upon them, as we were when they stood in the Bible. And, 6. That your Argument, That they signifie more than *Preaching the Word*, is no good One: because, make the best of it you can, there will be somewhat like an Authority of *Preaching* given in the *first* Commission to the Priest to be Ordained, though 'tis more Express in the *second*. You may take which of these Answers you please; but all together, I'm sure, they over and above prove against you.

To your Two Paragraphs following, I shall only say, It is *Truth*, and not *Authority*, we are to yield to. Therefore, I don't concern my self to look whether you represent these Great Men rightly or no, because 'tis not to the Purpose. Dr. *Hammond* never lost the Reputation of a Church-man, for fetching his *Annotations* from as Unorthodox a Stranger as any you mention: And no Man ought any more scruple taking *Truth* out of the *worst* Author, than yield to *Falshood* out of the *best*.

You find fault with His *Lordship*, in the next Paragraph, for passing by other *Enemies of the Church*, and fixing his Eye so much upon the *Papists*, as, in a great measure, to Over-look the Others. His *Lordship* has kept his Eye upon the *Papists* only where He should, in the *Articles* that were made against them: and, if He had not done it there, He had not done the *Articles* Justice, which lie under the same Imputation, of having kept their Eye upon the same Men. There was a great deal said against them, in the late *Reign*: but the *Bishop* was not to take notice of that, but to collect out of those Books the Arguments against those Enemies, and reduce them under the *Articles*, that they might be ready at hand for young Students in Divinity, against the Attempts of those restless Men, who are very *Numerous*, and notwithstanding all those Writings, and the late A C T against them, very Bold and Industrious. By your Argument, His *Lordship* need not have meddled with our other Adversaries, after the many admirable *Tracts* against them, in a late *Reign*, which are in more hands than those against the *Papists*: and thence our young Students might fetch Arguments, if the *Bishop* had none, which He has. He acknowledges Himself to be rather a Collector, than a Writer; and a young Student may provide himself with Arguments, out of Him, in the *Articles* made against those other Adversaries you speak of. I think, there are few of those *Articles*; and to have run away from the Business, to Encounter them, would have made Him Ridiculous. We have seen Men indeed so hot upon a Notion, and so angry at a Man or two, as to have

kept their Eyes unluckily upon them, and to have left their Texts to shift for themselves. But this is not the prudent, or honest Part. The *Bishop* speaks out, where-ever the *Articles* do, opposes all that they oppose, Answers the Objections against them, never has once made them *speak against themselves, or the received Doctrines of the Church*, nor to the advantage of the *Dissenters*, nor of *Constitutions opposite to our own*, except not Damning them, as the *Articles* do not, be speaking to their Advantage: And this, I hope, I have shown before, in Answering those strain'd Particulars you brought to prove these things against His *Lordship*. He has manag'd them with Temper, and I wish you had learn'd it of Him: He has not Vilify'd any One, nor Condemn'd any, but what the *Articles* do; but He has not over-done this, so as to be indifferent, or unjust to our Constitution, and His own Order, having given them all the *Articles* empower Him to do, not thinking it proper to an *Exposition* of the *Articles* to run upon Additions, which will not be in the least serviceable to an Explanation of them, which they do not give the least hint of, which the Compilers of them, it's likely, never thought of, or, if they did, thought not to make them *Terms of Communion*, as the *Articles* are.

I have already given an Answer to all your Particulars; but because you re-capitulate, I must do so too. The *Text* in *St. John* is only a *Various Lction*, and the *Socinian* don't want it granted not to be Genuine, because he'll never be convinc'd by what he suspects is not. What the *Bishop* says of the *Athanasian Creed*, relates only to its Confirmation by *Councils*, not to its Truth; and 'tis that the *Socinian* disputes against, and cares not how old you make it, so it be not in the *Scriptures*. However, be he gratify'd or no by it, both that *Text* is not in those *Manuscripts*, and this *Creed* never was Confirm'd by a *General Council*: And if you will have the Truth defended by a Lye, you must get some Body else to do it. The Distinction of *By the Law*, and *By the Law*, must be necessarily made in the *Article*; and the *Article* cannot, by all the Art in the World, be made to signifie any more than *By*. But the *Deist* is not a whit gratify'd hereby, for he denies Salvation by Christ, in all places. Under the XIXth *Article*, *No Lay-man, or Mechanick, is allow'd qualify'd to Baptize, or Preach*, but only such as act according to the Rule which the Body of the Pastors or Bishops of a Church have Settled, being Met in a Body, under due Respect to the Powers which God has set over them: as you may see, comparing the XIXth with the XXXIId. in which the *Presbyterians* and *Independents* have not the least Courtesy shown them, except they be such Persons, and so Met, as he speaks of in that Definition of *Lawful Authority*. The *Anabaptists* have nothing allow'd them in the XXVIIth. but what the Nature of the Dispute must force from us: and if they reckon their Point gain'd, as you kindly insinuate for them, upon such Allowance; I believe, upon what follows in the *Bishop*, they'll find as much reason to change their Note, as can be. The XXVIIIth *Article* brings the Doctrine of the *Sacrament* to plain Truth, and Sense: and if it does so, and makes no Mystery of

of it, I am oblig'd to think it right, because we are to make no Mysteries but where we are forc'd. And then for the *Quakers*, all His Lordship says, is, *The Texts seem to be express, and great Regard is to be had to a Scruple so founded*: but He proves the Lawfulness of *Oaths*, notwithstanding that seeming Expressness, for two Pages together; and in the last but one in the *Exposition*, Answers those two *Texts* just as fully as you do. I don't take notice of your Critical Remark, of the *Quakers* not being then known: For if the *Article* was made against the *Anabaptists*, who then did the same the *Quakers* do now, and the *Article* remains still in force; then the *Article* is now against the *Quakers*, who do the same now, that the *Anabaptists* did then. Indeed, the *Bishop* names neither of them, but talks only of the Thing it self, as express'd in the *Article*.

And now to Answer your *Reasonable Request*: One that has thought fit to Reply to your *Sheets*, and take upon him a Trouble far below the *Bishop*, will give you as many *Passages* against the *Enemies* of the Church, besides the *Papists*, as you have pretended to bring in favour of them. Though, 1st. I must say, I have already done it, by showing, That none of the *Passages* you bring, are in their favour. And, 2^{dly}. I might do it, by saying, That the *Bishop* has given the right Sense of the *Articles*, and some of them are penn'd in opposition to those *Adversaries*. He has given the Arguments on which they are founded; and therefore all those Arguments may fairly be said to be meant in favour of the Church of England by Law Establish'd, in opposition to those *Adversaries*. But I will not put you off so, but give you express *Passages* against those very *Enemies*, you say, he has favour'd. 1. then, Against the *Socinians*, There are Five Arguments to prove that *Jesus Christ* is God, the True God, from pag. 44, to 51. some of which you must allow to be sound, and unanswerable. For the *Satisfaction*, pag. 53. It is not possible for us to preserve any Reverence for the *New Testament*, or the *Writers* of it, so far as to think them *Honest Men*, not to say, *Divinely Inspir'd*, if we can imagine, that in so Sacred, and Important a Matter, they could exceed so much, as to represent That to be our Sacrifice, which is not truly so: and then, quoting the *Passages*, He says, In these, and a great many more *Passages*, it's as plain as words can make any thing, That the Death of *Christ* is propos'd to us as our Sacrifice, and Reconciliation, our Atonement, and Redemption: and so on, till He says, It has indeed remov'd Adam's Sin, but it has done a great deal more besides, &c. And, pag. 68. The *Adversaries* of the Trinity will have the Spirit, or Holy Spirit, to signifie no Person, but only the Divine Gifts, and Operations: But in opposition to this, it is plain, &c. to the end of the Paragraph, where He says, The Holy Spirit is propos'd to us as a Person under whose Oeconomy are all the various Gifts, Administrations, and Operations that are in the Church: and at the end of that *Article*, He is said to be God, by plain and clear Proofs. For the *Athanasian Creed*, He says, It imports no more than the Belief of the Doctrine of the Trinity, which has been already proved. In the *Article* of Original Sin, He Answers them for some Pages together, too long to transcribe. Good God! Whither are Justice and

and *Honesty* fled ? That ever any Man, who has in so many places, and so fully said such things as these, and many more, should be accus'd of favouring the *Socinians*, because of a *Text*, which, he says, is not in such or such *Manuscripts* ! If the best Book in the World were to be handled at this rate, what would become of our Religion ? Nay, what is become of it already, when the very Mark of it, *Charity*, is so sadly disregarded ? But, 2. Against the *Deists*, The whole Proof of the Truth of the Holy Scriptures, from pag. 59. to pag. 64. and He concludes thus that of *Christ's* Resurrection ; *When all this is laid together, it is the most unreasonable thing imaginable, to think there was an Imposture in this Matter, when no Colour, or Shadow of it, ever appear'd, and when all the Circumstances, and not only Probabilities, but even Moral Possibilities, are so full to the contrary : and pag. 88. and before, He gives an Account of the Inspiration of those Sacred Writings.*

But perhaps you don't count these Passages to be meant in favour of the *Church of England*, as by *Law* Establish'd, but merely of the *Christian Doctrine*. But I would have you remember, that you expressly accuse Him of being Courteous to these ; that you count these Persons, where they have nothing to do, as we shall see by and by, among the *Enemies that divide the Church* : And therefore you must give me leave to number them where they have somewhat to do, the *Articles* being Part of our *Legal Establishment*. If you mean *Establish'd by Law*, as oppos'd to those we commonly call *Dissenters*, we must not look for much against them in the *Articles*. There's but one against the *Anabaptists*, and but one or two that look against the *Presbyterians*, and *Independents*, and as many against the *Quakers*. The rest concern the common *Doctrines* of pure Christianity, and our Differences with the *Papists*, and therefore they could not chuse but have most said against them. However, against all *Dissenters* in general, pag. 194. is said, after a great deal to the same purpose ; *We who are under those Obligations to Unity, and Charity, with all Christians, ought to maintain the Unity of the Body, and the Decency, and Order, that is necessary for Peace, and mutual Edification. And just after ; If either Church or State have Power to make Rules, and Laws, in such Matters, they must have this Extent given them, That till they break in upon the Laws of God, and the Gospel, we must be bound to Obey them. A Mean cannot be put here : Either they have no Power at all, or they have a Power that must go to every thing that is not forbid by any Law of God. And just after ; The only Question in Point of Obedience, must be, Lawful, or Unlawful. For Expedient, and Inexpedient, ought never to be brought into Question, as to the Point of Obedience ; since no Inexpediency whatsoever can balance the Breaking of Order, and the Dissolving the Peace of Society : and so on. And in the XXXIVth Article, from one end almost to t'other ; A Schism that is occasion'd by any Church's imposing Unlawful Terms of Communion, lies at their door who impose them, and wholly theirs. But without such a Necessity, it is certainly, both in its own Nature, and its Consequences, one of the greatest of Sins, to create needless Disturbances in a Church, and to give Occasion to all that Alienation of Mind, all those Rash Censures,*

Censures, and Unjust Judgments, that do arise from such Divisions. This receives a very great Aggravation, if the Civil Authority has concurr'd, by a Law, to enjoin the Observance of such Indifferent Things. Can any thing be more Express than this, when said by One who thinks all Things enjoin'd in the Church of England Lawful, and that while He's Interpreting an Article of that very Church? There's a great deal more of the same in that place, which I should be a weary to write, and you asham'd to read.

Against those that Dissent upon the Case of mix'd Communion, and want of Discipline, besides what is said in other Articles generally, He says, p. 368. If the Execution of Church-Authority should happen to fall into great Disorders, so that many Scandalous Persons are not Censured, and a Promiscuous Multitude is suffer'd to break in upon the most Sacred Performances; this cannot justifie private Persons, who, upon that, withdraw from the Communion of the Church. All Order and Government are destroy'd, if private Persons take upon them to Judge and Censure others, or to Separate from any Body, because there are Abuses in the Use of this Authority.

*Against those loose Sectaries, who look upon any Mechanick, or Lay-man, as well Qualify'd to Baptize, or Preach, as those that are call'd Priests and Deacons, He says, pag. 256. These Rules given to Timothy and Titus, do plainly import, that there was to be an Authority in the Church, and that no Man was to assume that Authority to himself, &c. And after having shown, that the Apostles settled Orders in the Church, not so much for their own Times, as for those that come after, He says, The Argument for this, from the standing Rules of Order, and Decency, of the Authority in which the Holy Things ought to be maintained, and the Care that must be taken to repress Vanity and Insolence, and all the Extravagancies of light and ungovern'd Fancies, is very clear. For if every Man may assume Authority to Preach, and perform Holy Functions, it's certain, Religion must fall under contempt. And at last; If once the Publick Orders, and the National Constitution (Observe you) of a Church is dissolv'd, the Strength and Power, as well as the Order and Beauty of all Religion, will soon go after it: For, humanely speaking, they cannot subsist without it. Can you your self find out Expressions more home, and earnest? Can any One speak more to the Purpose than this? I beg your Pardon for the Incivility, but I can't help desiring the Reader to compare these Expressions with one or two of yours; pag. 56. His Lordship seems to set himself between the Church of England and the Dissenters, in the way of Moderator: No One can charge Him with Partiality; He manages the Whole in such sort, with respect to the Church, as, according to the usual Phrases, may be said to be without Favour or Affection. Pag. 57. All sort of loose Sectaries, who have no regard to Divine Commission, but look upon any Lay-man, or Mechanick, as well Qualify'd to Baptize, or Preach, as Those that are call'd Priests, and Deacons, have sufficient Encouragement to trust to the Word Preach'd, and the Sacraments Administred in their Way. And, pag. 22. If Men are Baptiz'd, it matters very little by whom it be done, so the Essentials of Water, &c. be retain'd: And so, for Preaching;
Let*

Let a number of Men, for their Honesty, have but a Right to be call'd Faithful, and a very little more shall make a Visible Church of them. And you have accus'd Him, in these places, of having favour'd our Independents, and Presbyterians, and loose Sectaries. Let but any One then compare His Expressions with your Accusations, and then judge of your Candour, and Integrity. For the Presbyterians, and Independents, they are excluded from being Lawfully Called, by the latter whole Paragraph in the 258th Page; tho' I can't promise you, they shall think themselves so: No more would they by the Article it self.

Against the Anabaptists, pag. 306. He says, *In a thing of this kind, in which the just Tenderness of Humane Nature does dispose Parents to secure to their Children a Title to the Mercies and Blessings of the Gospel, there is no reason to think, that, this being so fully set forth, and assured to the Jews in the Old Testament, Christ should not have intended to give Parents the same Comforts and Assurances, by his Gospel, that they had under the Law of Moses. Since nothing is said against it, we may conclude, from the Nature of the Two Dispensations, and the Proportion and Gradation that is between them, (the very Argument that you us'd against the Bishop, out of Himself) that Children under the New Testament are a Holy Seed, as well as they were under the Old; and, by consequence that they may be now Baptized, as well as they were then Circumcised. Observe those words, as well as, and consider your Accusation. And afterwards He concludes it again, from the Text of the Children brought to Our Saviour, Whatever these words may signify mystically, the literal meaning of them is, That little Children may be admitted into the Dispensation of the Messias, and consequently, that they may be Baptized. This, I suppose, is granting the Anabaptists all they desire, as you say.*

Against the Quakers, the Men that were not known when the Articles were made, as you shrewdly observe, He says, pag. 255. *Not suffering Women to Teach, like the Women-Priests among the Heathen, who were believed to be fill'd with a Bacchick Fury. And about the Lawfulness of War, and going to Law, and resisting Evil, (though He's so civil to them, as to say, the words of Our Saviour seem to be express, and full) He says, Upon all these Accounts, spoken of before, we doubt not, but that Wars, which are originally, as to the first Occasion of them, Defensive, though, in the progress of them, they must often be Offensive, may be Lawful. And, Lastly, About an Oath, He allows all He can justly to them; and yet proves the Lawfulness of it, from the Example of the Patriarchs, the Jewish Constitution, Our Saviour, and God Himself: and Answers the Objection, by shewing the right meaning of Communication; and concludes, That a Man may Swear, when the Magistrate requires it.*

Thus have I given you what you call'd for: though 'twas no such very reasonable Request, considering the Number of the Articles against the Papists, and the general Expressions the Exposition was reasonably oblig'd to keep to, in compliance with the Articles. I doubt not, I might, upon a strict Search, have found many more particular ones, but these are enough. For if we will but be as favourable to His Lordship's Compositions, as we are to the
Divine

Divine ones, and interpret the Places which are more general and doubtful, by those which are more determinate and particular, we shall soon clear His Lordship of your Charge: and if we will not, we are very Unjust, and deny those Grains of Allowance to a *Humane* Composure, without which even the *Divine* Oracles may be wrested to any Sense, or none at all, as we please. Had you read His Lordship with the same Spirit that you advise your Hearers to read the Scriptures, we had not been troubled with such groundless Charges of Him: If you did not so read *him*, neither do you so read the *Scriptures* as you advise your Hearers. They would have taught you another Temper, and Carriage, to a Man, a Christian, and a Bishop.

All I shall beg of you, in Return to this tedious Digression, is, If you think fit to Reply to these Sheets, to make your Exposition of the *Articles* agree with the *Design and Meaning* of them, the *received Doctrine* of the Church of England, the *Honour of the Reformation*, and with common Sense, and Truth. If you cannot; How much more justly will you fall under the Censure of the *Convocation*, than you can pretend to have had their *Approbation*? The *Articles* then, according to you, are these.

ART. VI. Whoever says, that the Text in St. John's Epistle, c. 5. 7. is not in the Manuscript at Zurich, or in those two at Basil, or at Strasburg, and thinks, though there are considerable things urged to support its Authority, yet that it is safer to build upon sure and indisputable Grounds; favours the Socinians, does not believe the Canonical Scriptures, and cannot honestly Subscribe to them.

ART. VIII. The Creed call'd the Nicene Creed was made by the Council of Nice; and that call'd the Athanasian, by Athanasius; and was heard of before the Eighth Century, and was Confirm'd by a General Council.

ART. IX. to the XIX. These Articles are necessary to be believed by every One who has a Federal Right in the Covenant of Grace; for they contain not Doctrinal, but Fundamental Points; and therefore they are accursed (as the XVIIIth says, which is only the Summ of these) who hold not all contain'd in them: particularly,

ART. XVIII. They are to be accursed, who say, that any Man can be saved in the Law or Sect that he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his Life according to that Law, and the Light of Nature. For Holy Scripture doth set forth to us, That Men cannot be Saved, but in the Outward Profession of the Christian Religion.

ART. XIX. The Visible Church of Christ, is a Congregation of Faithful Men, in which the pure Word of God is Preach'd, and the Sacraments duly Administred according to the Ordinance of Christ, in all things requisite to a regular Administration of the same.

ART. XXIII. It is not lawful for any Man to take upon him the Office of Publick Preaching, or Ministering the Sacraments in the Congregation, before

be be Lawfully Called, and sent to execute the same. And those we ought to judge Lawfully Called and Sent, and only Those, who are sent by Bishops, and, whatsoever National Constitution they live under, have Episcopal Ordination. For none but They have Power to send Labourers into the Lord's Vineyard: And therefore all those Preachers in Foreign Churches not so Ordained, have no Lawful Call, are no Lawful Preachers.

ART. XXVII. The Baptism of young Children is necessarily to be retained in the Church, for that it is expressly commanded in the Institution of Christ.

ART. XXXIII. That Person, which, by open Denunciation of the Church, is rightly cut off from the Unity of the Church, and Excommunicate, ought to be taken by the whole Multitude of the Faithful as a Heathen, and a Publican; as is proved by the Text in St. Matthew, chap. xviii. 17. where the being look'd upon as a Heathen, and a Publican, is consequent to his Excommunication.

ART. XXXIX. There is no respect to be had to the Scruple of those, who think an Oath to be Unlawful. For in those Texts, Mat. 5. 34. and Jam. 5. 12. there is not so much as a seeming Expressness in their favour.

I might add that of *Hell*, and that of the *Mystery in the Sacrament*; but they are not so notorious as these: some of which are not true; and the others, if true, not of such Importance as to be made *Terms of Communion*. You cannot deny, either that these are your *Articles*, or that you have unjustly and falsely Abus'd the *Bishop*. For, give me leave to ask you a few Questions — Don't you say, this is the meaning of those *Articles*? Don't you suppose that every One must Subscribe them in this Sense? For, Is not this the Sense which is, you say, collected from other *Authenticall Explanations* of the Church's Mind? And are not Men to take their Measures, in Subscribing to the *Articles*, and be Directed therein by *them*? Don't you find fault with the *Bishop* for not interpreting them in this Sense, as going contrary to their Meaning? And is the *Bishop* in any fault, if He interpret them in such a Sense as any One may Subscribe them in? And can any One Subscribe them in a Sense contrary to their Meaning? And is not the Meaning of the *Article*, which every One must Subscribe them in, the *Article* it self, the *Term of Communion*? And are not these that you have propos'd as the Meaning of the *Articles*, very hard things to be made such *Terms*? I don't see how you can get off of this: And if you can't, I don't see how you can get rid of your Account of the *Moderation of the Church of England*, which is utterly inconsistent with it. I will say no more, but leave you to your own Thoughts, and proceed to the *Third Head*, (*viz.*)

That there are some Things in the said Book, which seem to be of dangerous Consequence to the Church of England as by Law Establish'd, and to derogate from the Honour of the Reformation.

It can't but be of ill Consequence, you say, that any private Person shall, at pleasure, take the liberty of putting what Sense he pleases upon the Publick Acts of the

the Church: No Man can put what Sense *he pleases* upon them, because the Words will determine him to some Sense; but a private Person may, nay, every One that Subscribes, does, and cannot but, put that Sense, which he thinks the truest, on them. And what is allow'd to All that Subscribe, who don't All do it in the same Sense, can't be deny'd the Bishop, who would teach them to understand the *Articles*, and be able to subscribe them in a right Sense, form'd upon good Considerations. Rogers ventur'd upon it: *His Book had its Use and Course, and stood long without Censure, notwithstanding his Partiality to one Side.* Are not the Oracles of God more Sacred Things, than the *Articles* of our Church? And yet what are all *Paraphrases, Notes, and Commentaries*, but *Expositions* of the Word of God? Suppose any part of a *Paraphrase, or Commentary*, should be found to be wrong; Do Men clamour upon that, and think the Word of God is corrupted? Is not the Apostles Creed one of the most important Parts both of our Worship, and one of our *Articles*? but was it ever thought a *Presumption*, to write an *Exposition* of that Common Symbol of Christians? *Articles*, to which every One who Serves in the Church must Subscribe willingly, and from their Heart, professing that they believe them to be agreeable to the Word of God, ought to be well understood by those, who profess their unfeigned Assent to them. These are the Bishop's words.

This will serve for an Answer to your next Paragraph: adding this; That this Book was written upon the Authority of a Sovereign, and a Superiour; was communicated to many Eminent Persons; was strictly examin'd by them, and candidly censur'd. And, I doubt not, notwithstanding what you say, the Bishops, who felt the ill Consequences of Subscribers Ignorance in the *Articles*, and thought themselves therefore oblig'd to Examine their Clergy with some Care, and did not know how to admit them to Subscribe *Articles*, to which they were such Strangers, now feel the Good of what many wise Men wish'd for, and see some happy Effects of such an Undertaking.

Those Great and Judicious Men, who did what of this kind they judg'd needful in another way, and Explain'd, as they had occasion, Matters belonging to the *Articles*, under the Name of much more Sacred Things, shew'd by that, that they did not think the *Articles* were too Sacred to be meddled with. For an Explanation of any of them, is as much an Explanation in another place, as if it stood in its own, and under its own proper Title; and any thing that Contradicts or Mis-interprets them, is as much a Contradiction or Mis-interpretation of them, under any Name, and in any Book, as if it went under the Name of an *Exposition* of them. Their Modesty and Caution consisted only in avoiding the Clamours of Hot Men, who would not have born any thing in that Nature contrary to their Sentiments. But Matters were now grown to that pass, as not to dispense with that Modesty and Caution any longer: and a Bishop, who had best reason to know the Use, having felt the Want of it, did venture to collect a Provision for young Students, before they come to receive Holy Orders. 'Twas a Bold thing indeed: but Boldness and Resolution is, in some places, and upon some accounts, necessary; especially

especially in a Man, who when he is to do Good, has always Disadvantages to cope with, and who, had he compos'd the *Articles* themselves, might have probably expected a like, or a severer Censure. The rest of your Paragraph is not to the Purpose, after what has been said.

But your next Paragraph is for having an *Authentick Exposition*; and the Matter *Debated in Convocation*; and the *Persons appointed by Them*, to Compose it. To speak seriously, I think a Binding and Obligatory Authority upon such a thing as that, would be no happiness to the Church; and, as good as it is, it is well that the *Bishops* hath it not, but that every One's left to form his own Judgment upon it. As for your Argument against Him as a *Stranger*, One that knows nothing of our Constitution, that came hither but t'other day, and has no Insight into the Matters of our Church, I must confess 'tis unanswerable.

So much for the Undertaking. Now for the pretended Authority it comes out with. The late Archbishop put Him upon it; encourag'd, and Approv'd it. It had the Approbation of our two present *Metropolitans*, many of our *Bishops*, and learned *Divines*. This the Bishop says Himself, to Recommend, and Justifie His Work: And for you to call it pretended, is not becoming either your Character, or His.

And can any thing, you say, look more Fatal to the Establish'd Church, than to have a Platform laid for Comprehension, and a Way scor'd out for Evading the Force of all Subscriptions, and this to be usher'd in with so much seeming Authority. If you mean by that Scare-crow Comprehension, a Fortifying the Church, by as great an Union as could consist with her Principles, and with the Desires of the most Eminent Men that have been of our Communion, both in the present and last Age, it is a Noble and Excellent Design. If you mean something as bad by it, as you do by the Evading the Force of Subscription; I have shown you, there's no such thing: and had I not, I should have ventur'd to trust to the Approbation of those Great Men, that there's no such ill Design in the Book; and to the Bishop's Word, that they gave their Approbation. Their Judgments, and His Honesty, are as much to be depended upon with me, as yours. But I cannot but a little wonder how you can smite the Bishop from all sides thus. Sometimes 'tis the Attempt of a private Man; and then, tis Bold, and Impudent, void of Modesty, and Caution. Again, when you find it has a seeming Authority, then 'tis Dangerous, and gives Alarms and Jealousies to True Churchmen. These Jealousies occasion Disputes: These Disputes do Mischief. All I can say to that, is, That since they do Mischief, they should be, as much as possible, avoided; never courted and embraced. If Just Occasions be offer'd, those that offer them are highly to be blamed; if Unjust one's be taken, those that take them. Let others justifie their own Behaviour in these Disputes, and the necessity of undertaking them; I am to justifie the Bishop, That He never offer'd any Occasion for them: which, I think, I easily can. For his Book has no more Authority belonging to it, than as Men shall think fit to pay a modest Deference to that, which has pass'd the Corrections

rections of so exact Judgments, and shall find reason to yield to the Arguments and Reasons brought in it. 'Tis not Bound upon any One, any farther than all Truth and Reason is; Men are at liberty to follow or reject it, as they think it consonant or repugnant to *that*: And if there should be any thing in it which any One should object against the *Church of England*, and She should be asham'd to own as Her Doctrine, She may fairly renounce it. The *Bishop* Himself formally disclaims any such Authority, *pag. II.* in the *Preface*: *After all these Approbations, and many repeated Desires to me to Publish it, I do not pretend to impose this upon the Reader as the Work of Authority. My Design, in giving this Relation of the Motives that led me first to Compose, and now to Publish this Work, is only to justify my self both in the one and the other, and to shew that I was not led by any Presumption of my Own, or with any Design to Dictate to Others.* 'Twould make a Man almost resolved to depend foolishly upon himself wholly, to run into the World with Heat, and Inconsideration, and reject and despise the Counsel, or Judgment, or Correction of his Friends, and prefer Rashness and Presumption, before Coolness and Exactness; to see a Man Abus'd, for the very thing that He did to prevent all Abuses; and *that* laid to Him as a Fault, which He us'd to make Him less faulty than He would have been otherwise thought. That indeed, I believe, is your Vexation; and His Caution in being Exact, is a Fault; because His being so, is a Disturbance.

This is an Answer likewise to your next Paragraph: You complain there of an *Unhappiness* that is very easily remedy'd, and wou'd be so, did the *Name of a Bishop*, or a whole House of Bishops, go so far as you jeeringly pretend. If any *Papist*, or *Dissenter*, which there's no fear of, should quote any thing out of that Book, as the Doctrine of our Church, against Those they oppose, they must do, as in other Writers, defend it, if it be true; and deny it to be our Doctrine, if it be false, and not in any of the *Authenticall Books of the Church*. Your Sentence about the *Bishop of Worcester*, shall be Answer'd in its due place; your modest Confidence cannot, no more than it can be parallell'd. A *Presbyter* giving a *Bishop* the Lye, only upon an idle Suspicion, against plain Assertions, and all the while complaining of the *Unhappiness* that puts that Force upon him, is a Character that I hardly ever saw to the Life before.

Your next Paragraph is already Answer'd, by Answering the Instances you brought to prove it. There I have shown, That there's no *Undermining Foundations*, nor *Frustrating Designs*; but the same *Regard is had to Men of different Persuasions*, to keep them from the Ministry, as in the *Articles*.

Let us now come to your Particulars. And,

I. In the first Leaf, His Majesty has a wrong State of the Case given Him, as to our Differences in Religion: and a great deal of blame might seem to lie at our door, were it really true, that the Wounds and Breaches made among those, who in common profess the same Faith, are owing to their being unhappily disjointed, and divided by some Differences, that are of less Importance. You take the Consequence here upon your self, That if we are disjointed by Differences in things of less Importance

tance (than those in which we are agreed, or, than that ought to disjoin us) we are then to blame. I can't imagine how you will clear your self from the Assumption, and therefore the *Conclusion* must be yours too. I find many of them call'd, by the best Defenders of our Church, *Indifferent Matters, Matters of less Concern, of less Moment*; and many such Expressions, which amount to the same thing with *Matters of less Importance*.

You need not have taken the Pains to show *that this is no Slip, or Mistake*, from the *Author's Discourse with a Foreign Divine*; because, 'tis what no Body need be asham'd to own. The Lutheran is brought in, *objecting against our Church, That our Disputes are only about Forms of Government, and Worship, and about things that were in their own nature Indifferent*. How the Lutheran was Answer'd we are not told, but we may easily guess to what Effect it was, by the Prayer which follows, which is, *That God would direct and enlighten all Men to consider well how it ought to be Answer'd: which looks as if he that thus prays were of the same Opinion with the Lutheran*. What if he were of the same Opinion with him, and did wish, that after we had been quarelling above these Hundred Years, we might at last grow wiser, and might all of us be enlightned and directed, some to leave our Heights, and make tolerable Concessions, and others to accept of them, and come in: For the Prayer refers much more to the *Dissenters*, than to *Us*. And, if there were any hopes, that, upon the receding from some Indifferent Impositions, they would Come in, and make One Body with Us, I don't know how an Honest Man could be angry at it, or at any One that prays for it. All that any object against it, is the Impracticableness of it; but if they were enlightned, and directed in the best Way, that would go off; and the Supposition is always put, If it were Practicable: and therefore 'tis not fair for Any to Exclaim against those that think 'twould be then Reasonable, because they themselves think it not Practicable. You here, according to your usual Fairness, and Upright Dealing, conceal part of the Story, which was put in to avoid Mistakes: viz. *It was in the Year 1686*. and then you count up our Enemies *Papists, Socinians, Deists, Quakers, &c.* when every One must know these are not such as the Disputes were then with: These are not such as differ only in *Forms of Government, and Worship, and Indifferent things*; these are not such as in common profess the same Faith with us: nor would you have thought they were so, but that you wanted an Occasion to make a dismal Exclamation or two.

2. Something is said of our Divines to the King, which can by no means redound to their Credit, in point of dealing Sincerely either with God, or Man. They are suppos'd to have pray'd for two Kings successively, as Defenders of the Faith, whom at the same time they apprehended to be led into the Design of Overturning it. This is not rightly represented: for though the Bishop uses the word *those*, it's plain to me, He means only *King James*; and it's a common thing to use the Plural for the Singular: nor does He say any thing that they apprehended their Designs: He speaks of the Design, as a thing past, *Who had been fatally led*, and that's enough to make a Man asham'd of giving them that Title.

But

But you say, 1. 'Tis a question whether by the Title of Defender of the Faith, we must necessarily mean, Defender of the Protestant Religion, or only the Christian Religion in General, since that Title was Inherent to the Imperial Crown of this Realm long before the Reformation. As that Title is continu'd on to our Kings since the Reformation, in a Protestant Country, it seems to refer to the Faith Here Establish'd. However, I would grant it such a Title, as we need not be asham'd to give, were your 2d Point true, which the Bishop, when He says this, supposes to be false, and which certainly is so, namely, That if we enjoy the Profession of our Religion, and the Protection of the Law, this may be sufficient to justify us in giving the Title. Had we done so, it had been somewhat like Justifiable: but as 'twas just the contrary, I wonder you were not asham'd to put the Question. A Man may be asham'd of what he has done, without Prevarication; and Shame may be often very innocent.

Another like Piece of Insincerity is laid to our English Divines Charge, in the beginning of the Preface: you quote the words, and say, It is again suggested by the Bishop, p. 168. where you might likewise have met with an Answer. The Bishop's words there are these: It is not to be denied, but that the Article seems to be framed according to St. Austin's Doctrine — But that in which the Knot of the whole Difficulty lies is not defined, that is, Whether God's Eternal Purpose, or Decree, was made according to what He foresaw his Creatures would do, or purely upon an Absolute Will, in order to his own Glory. It is very probable, that they who penn'd it meant that the Decree was Absolute; but yet, since they have not said it, those who Subscribe the Articles do not seem to be bound to any thing that is not express'd in them. And therefore, since the Remonstrants do not deny but that God, having foreseen what all Mankind would, according to all the different Circumstances in which they would be put, do, or not do; He, upon that, did, by a Firm and Eternal Decree, lay that whole Design in all its Branches, which He executes in Time; they may subscribe this Article, without renouncing their Opinion as to this Matter. I leave it to the Reader to judge whether this be so heinous a Prevarication as you represent it.

3. A very ill Use might be made of a very groundless Suggestion to be met with both at the End of the Introduction, and at the Beginning of the Exposition of the XXth Article; in both which the Reader is led to imagine, that the Printed Articles to which we Subscribe, vary in very many Particulars from the Originals, &c. At the End of the Introduction, if any One will please to look there, he will find a full Answer to this Difficulty, and that you took from it all that you here say against the Bishop. You say, Those Articles in Corpus Christi College are to be by no means look'd upon as the last Originals from the which our Articles are Printed. The last Record was doubtless either burnt in the Fire of London, 1666. or hath otherwise happen'd to be lost. Where had you this, but from the End of the Introduction? where the Bishop says, The true Account of this Difficulty is this: When the Articles were first Settled, they were Subscrib'd by both Houses upon Paper; but that being done, they were afterwards Engross'd in Parchment, and made up in Form, to remain as Records — These Alterations then were made between the
time

time they were first Subscrib'd and the last Voting of them. But the Original Records, which, if extant, would have clear'd the whole Matter, having been burnt in the Fire of London, it is not possible to appeal to them; yet what has been propos'd, may serve, I hope, fully to clear the Difficulty. Reflect upon what you have said, and see if you can justify it to God, and your own Conscience.

You say indeed, *As much as this seems to be intimated at the End of the Introduction; that is, in a whole Folio Page, on purpose to clear the Difficulty. A pretty seeming Intimation. But in the XXth Article we are told what revives the Difficulty; that is, we han't there this Page over again, because the Bishop thought every One who read the Book, would read the Introduction. I don't know whether you did read it or no, when you Answer'd Him. But let us go on — You say, In the XXth Article, The Expositor says, The first words of this Article were put in this place, according to the Printed Editions, though they are not in the Original of the Articles that are yet extant. Who would not hence infer, say you upon this, that these words were not in the Original Sign'd in Convocation, whenas His Lordship can only mean that Manuscript in Corpus Christi College. His Lordship means that, to be sure; and any Reader may see He does, by those words, yet Extant: for His Lordship had told them before, that the Engross'd Originals were burnt. You go on — For that they were in that Original from whence our Articles were Printed, (and which was Sign'd in Convocation, as well as that imperfect Draught still remaining) was put beyond all Dispute or Question by Archbishop Laud, in a Speech in the Star-Chamber, and by Dr. Heylin, in his History of Presbytery, p. 268. as there may be occasion hereafter to shew more at large. I believe I shall free you from the shame of laying hold on that Occasion, by giving the Reader the Bishop's words, and I seriously profess they are his: p. 16. These Articles were first Printed in the Year 1563. conform to the present Impressions which are still in Use among us. So the Alterations were then made when the thing was fresh, and well known; therefore no Fraud or Artifice is to be suspected, since some Objections would have been then made, especially by the great Party of the complying Papists who then continued in the Church: They would not have fail'd to have made much use of this, and to have taken great Advantages from it, if there had been any occasion for it; and yet nothing of this kind was then done. One Alteration of more Importance was made in the Year 1571. Those words of the XXth Article, The Church has Power to Decree Rites or Ceremonies, and Authority in Controversies of Faith, were left out both in the Manuscripts, and in the Printed Editions, but were afterwards restored, according to the Articles Printed Anno 1563. I cannot find out in what Year they were again put in the Printed Copies. They appear in two several Impressions in Queen Elizabeth's time, which are in my hands. It passes commonly, that it was done by Archbishop Laud; and his Enemies laid this upon him, among other things, That he had corrupted the Doctrine of this Church, by this Addition: but He clear'd himself of that, as well he might, and in a Speech in the Star-Chamber appeal'd to the Original, and affirmed these words were in it. — I must again assure the Reader, that these are the Bishop's words, and desire him to look to the place; for, in this Case, I*

scarce

scarce dare trust my own Eyes, and am afraid therefore *he* will not my Word. If a Man may be allow'd thus to mis-represent Others, we can never be safe in what we say. *No sort of Security can be had from Mens Words, the usual Means of expressing their Minds: Nothing can hold a Man that can come up to these Measures. And yet this is the Method that you settle, in handling the Bishop of Sarum.*

You see then, *so great an Historian as My Lord of Sarum is, was not ignorant of this Matter of Fact.* And you must know, He was not, if you look into the *Introduction*, where he fully clears the Difficulty, and takes off *all Scruple that might otherwise lie upon Ministers, who are to read the Articles in the face of the Congregation.* And now tell me, I pray you, What has the *Bishop of Sarum* done, to be thus used? Wherein has he so forfeited all the Rights of Humane Nature, as to have the Dues, I won't say, of *Respect*, or *Charitable Favour*, but even of *Common Justice*, deny'd Him? Whither do Party and Passion hurry a Man! How does the Hatred or Love of a Man, or a Sett of Men, make him to forget his Religion, his Conscience, and the *terrible Day of the Lord!* These are Serious and Important Matters, not to be jested, or dispensed with, when we see fit.

The *Instances* you have mention'd being all of them false, do not prove what you brought them for, That *the Exposition is of dangerous Consequence to the Church*, in many Respects. Let us see now, whether *that* which is behind, of greater Consequence when fully consider'd, prove what you suggest it does: and whether you have not herein also falsly accus'd the *Bishop* of doing what may, one day or other, prove fatal to the *Church*.

I shall keep here to the Dispute in hand, and not enter into any thing foreign thereto. The King's Power in Spirituals, is a tender Point, and above my reach, and beside this Controversie, which seems to turn only upon this, Whether our Kings did not by their own Authority, with the Advice of some few of the Clergy, make some Steps in the Reformation of the Church; and therein did not observe those Rules that ought to be Sacred in Regular Times: and whether this Procedure of theirs, considering the Exigencies and Circumstances of those Times, was not justifiable, because necessary to the bringing about that Glorious End, which, without a Miracle, could not have been expected otherwise to be gained? That is, whether they had not a Lawful Power to do as they did, though that Power were not then exercised according to the Methods it ought to be. I shall therefore pass by your first three Paragraphs in this Head, and suffer them to be true, though there are many things in them very exceptionable. Your Fourth blames the *Bishop*, for *throwing down the Boundaries, in his Scheme for Latitude*; and more, for *making all Changes Practicable, without going the Round-about Ways of Convocation and Parliament.* You Exclaim at it very highly, and Argue against it very earnestly, and ridiculously, from the Abuses that have been, or may be made of it. The *Bishop* says, *When the Body of the Clergy comes to be so corrupted, that nothing can be trusted to the Regular Decisions of any Synod, or Meeting, then the King may*

select a peculiar Number, and give the Legal Sanction to what they shall offer Him, &c. The Question is, whether this be a true Rule ; not, whether it be liable to Abuse : for that's no question, of the best and most necessary things in the World. You your self allow something like this, in another Case — *It is only (p. 68.) in Cases of great Necessity, that the Secular Power does ever go about to Over-rule that Authority that is lodg'd in the Church, &c.* And might not I argue against you, That here, the Secular Power it self being Judge of the Necessity, you open a Way for it to do what it lists with the Church, whenever it pleases to think there is such a great Necessity. Men, doubtless, may, out of a misguided Conscience, or an Arbitrary will, think there is, or make such a Necessity, and act upon those Thoughts according as a real Necessity would warrant them to do ; but as this does not excuse them, so it does no prejudice to a real and not mistaken Necessity. This way of Arguing of yours would spoil all the Rules in the World, if because those Men who must be Judges of the Rule, may mistake it, therefore the Rule it self is to be rejected. *If there's need of a Reformation, there ought to be one,* is a certain Rule : and yet, the Prince being Judge of this Rule, it was as much abus'd by Queen Mary, as 'twas rightly used by King Edward, or as it had like to have been again abused by King James ; and yet the Rule's a good one still, though never so liable to be mistaken. If there be a Real Necessity, whether it be a great one, or a little one, as you learnedly distinguish, you know, of old, that it *over-rules things of course*, and makes Regularity and Order yield to it. Now if Men would destroy Regularity, and Order, and break through those Measures of Decency, and Custom, upon a suppos'd Necessity of doing it, towards the attaining Ends of greater Moment than Decency and Order are, let them bear the blame, and let all concerned *make a stand*, in opposition to their Practices ; but don't let Necessity, Real and Unfeign'd Necessity, suffer in the Conflict, but let it be allow'd its due Superiority over those *Matters of Course*. The Bishop, in those words, supposes such a Necessity ; and therefore, I hope, may be favour'd with what you can't deny to be the necessary Consequences of it. How much soever it may be abus'd, by being falsely suppos'd, and put upon us, when it really does fall out, Regularity must give place. You talk of His *promoting an Absolute Sovereignty in Spirituals*, and desire He would Explain Himself. If these Words want Explanation, I'll promise He shall : *They were Prepared (says He, p. 5.) as is most probable, by Cranmer, and Ridley, and Publish'd by the Regal Authority. Not as if our Kings had pretended to an Authority to Judge in Points of Faith, or to Decide Controversies, &c.* He never any where asserts any such *Absolute Sovereignty*, or any thing like it ; nay, He Excuses, and Justifies their departing from the Settled Methods, by the Necessity of it, as we shall see in the next Paragraph.

You bring there the Bishop's Words, and carefully conceal the Main of them in this Matter. After the words, *Establish'd Rules*, you make a long Stroke : but the Bishop says thus ; *And that therefore it ought to be very seldom put in Practice, and never but when the greatness of the Occasion will balance this Irregularity that is*

in it. But still here is, &c. (as you quote it.) This somewhat explains, and softens that Passage. And, I presume, no Body can deny, that when there is a great and necessary Good to be done, and no hopes of doing it in the Ordinary, and Regular, Customary Methods of doing things of that Nature, there the *Prince* may break through those Methods, and perfect the Design, by his own bare Authority. The Question is put upon Supposition, that the Good to be done, is of greater Consideration than *Regularity* is; and then it will follow, that *Regularity*, and *Legal Custom*, must yield to it: And, as you must then grant, it ought; so, on the other hand, we will readily grant you, that without such an apparent greater Good to be done, the *Regular Methods* of *Synodical Debates*, and *Decisions*, ought not to have been neglected, and pass'd by, as they certainly were, in many steps of the *Reformation*.

But though this, consider'd singly, be certainly true, and the Rule be in no more danger to be abused, than all others are; yet the *Bishop's* way of guarding it is such, as to have taken off all Ambiguity, such as *has given it all the Proviso's it stands in need of*, if He may be allow'd the favour all Writers have, of having one Passage explain'd and determin'd by another. He says, (p. 5. where He is speaking of the *Articles*) *They were Prepared, as is most probable, by Cranmer, and Ridley, and Publish'd by the Regal Authority. Not as if our Kings had pretended to an Authority to Judge in Points of Faith, or to Decide Controversies. But as every private Man must chuse for himself, and believe according to the Convictions of his Reason, and Conscience; so ev'ry Prince, or Legislative Power (You see, He distinguishes them) must give the Publick Sanction, and Authority, according to his own Persuasion. This makes indeed such a Sanction to become a Law, but does not alter the Nature of Things, nor oblige the Consciences of Subjects, unless they come under the same Persuasions. Such Laws have indeed the Operation of all other Laws; but the Doctrines Authorized by them have no more Truth than they had before, without any such Publication. Here's a Limitation, you see, with respect to the Law of God; and those words, The Prince, or Legislative Power, are a Limitation, with respect to the Constitution of States, or Kingdoms.*

You say, *The Apology made for the Irregularity*, in the Passage quoted from the *Bishop*, shows He meant only the *Prince*, not in Conjunction with the *Three Estates of the Realm*. Suppose now, for once, that the *Bishop* (though His Expressions be General, and applicable to All Constitutions) meant the *King of England*, acting after that manner in the *Reformation*; we shall find that the *Fact* is true, and the *Right* indisputable, though irregularly exercis'd: but this can no more justify the Proceedings of a *late Reign*, than a *true Rule* can all the *Mistakes* in applying it.

Your next Paragraph I have Answer'd already. 'Tis an Extravagance, to rail against any *Rule*, or *Order*, for the Abuses of it; being they depend not upon it, but upon Mens Wickedness, and Folly. But this is not the first *Presbyterian Argument* that hath been used in Writings of the like Nature with the *Prefatory Discourse*.

Those Instances from Scripture in the XXXVIIth *Article* you should not only have affirm'd, but prov'd to have been *falsly cited, and applied*. Till I know what you have to say, I know not what I have to answer. And so likewise you should have told us those *Regular Synods* whose *Advice and Concurrence* you blame the *Bishop* for passing by. This might, in Justice, have been expected from you: and your leaving it undone, looks as if you spoke at a venture, upon an Imaginary Scheme you have laid in your Head. I am sure, except you allow such a Power in the Prince, upon Extraordinary Occasions, without the Advice and Concurrence of a *Regular Synod*, you cannot justify the Proceedings in the *Reformation*. And then you do justify, and yet allow such Irregularities in them, as we shall see by and by.

You need not ask His *Lordship's* Leave to say what you do. His *Lordship* will allow it generally to be true, and requisite that they should, and always but when there's such a Good to be done, which cannot be done the *Regular Way*, as will balance the *Irregularity*. He gives as much Authority and Force as you can to *Custom* and *Regularity*, and supposes them to yield only to a *Necessity*; in which they must be stept over, or broke through, or else something of greater Concern and Importance be lost.

Thus much for the *Right*. Now we come to enquire whether in any Part of our *Reformation* there were any such *Irregular Steps* made, as to require such a Justification. This, you say, the *Bishop suggests*, and thereby *derogates from the Honour of the Reformation*. This is a sad thing, that either all Proceedings must have been *Regular*, or else our *Reformation* Dishonourable. If this Consequence be Necessary, the *Honour of the Reformation* must sink. For no Man can deny, and you your self grant, there were some such Steps; and, if you did not, might be soon brought to confess it, when almost every Action of King Henry, by his *Vicar-Generat*, in making Canons, or Injunctions, without going the *Round-about Way of Convocation*; and those in King Edward's Reign likewise are so evidently against you. For my part, I can't see how the *Honour of the Reformation* is at all touch'd by the Irregularity of these Actions, since, humanely speaking, there could have been no *Reformation* without it. 'Twas an happiness there were no more; but had there been, upon the same Grounds, it had been no Dishonour to yield to Necessity.

You say, *What most redounds to the Honour of our Church, is, the having had all things transacted in a more regular way, than perhaps in any other Reform'd Church whatsoever*. Who will deny this? Not the *Bishop*, who expressly says, *That We had been less forc'd to go out of the beaten-Road than They*. Things, generally speaking, you say, were carry'd on according to the ancient Rules of *Synodical Debates, and Decisions*. Here you acknowledge all things were not: and if your *perhaps*, and your *generally speaking*, don't amount to as much as the *Bishop* says, to *derogate from the Honour of the Reformation*, let the Reader judge. *They knew*, says He, *that though they had been less forc'd to go out of the beaten-Path than others, yet all things among themselves had not gone according to those Rules, that ought to be Sacred in Regular Times*. What justify'd their departure from

from those Methods, in those fewer things, was *Necessity* : And, supposing there had been the same *Necessity* for doing it in more, there had been no help, they must have yielded. 'Tis your unhappiness, to do, what you blame the *Bishop* for, and Truth forces you to, against your own Accusation. And this you do, as before, so in this particularly, where you say as much as the *Bishop*, to bring us upon the Level with other Churches.

As for your next Paragraph, 'tis merely the Imagination of your own Brain, without the least Light of History : *The Convocation bore a Considerable Part in the most material Steps that were made towards the Reformation*. It signifies not whether they did or no ; for, if there were any in which they did not, those were Irregular. But 'twould be worth your while to specify some of them till Queen *Elizabeth*, and to give us some of the *Canons* they made ; to make out, that they fram'd the *Articles*, and the *Liturgy*. Indeed, as the *Reformation* grew nearer to a Head, the *Regularity* in Proceedings encreas'd, and the *Convocation* grew to have a greater Hand in it ; but before that, many things properly belonging to them, and in Regular Times their due, were transacted without them : and had the *Bishop* any where taken notice more than He does (for the *Honour of the Reformation*) of the *Convocation*, it had been so easily refuted, that, instead of doing the *Church Service*, He had forfeited his own *Honour* and *Credit*.

His *History* is not in this Place to be defended : It is far above your weak Designs to lessen it ; and it hath stood the Attack of as ready a Heart, and a much abler Hand than your own, without any material Prejudice. But it's no wonder that it should not take much notice, as of a Leading thing, of the *Convocational Decisions* you speak of, since they are, for the most part, merely the Fancy of your own Head, perfect Romance, to be met with no where, except, perchance, in some well kept and inaccessible Extracts.

In your next Paragraph, after a small fault, of the *Convocations constantly Meeting and Sitting with the Parliament*, you blame the *Bishop*, for giving so short an Account of the *Convocation* in the Year 1552. which, whether it don't comprehend all that they did Material as to that of which he was writing the History, we are to see by and by, besides *Philpot's Story*, which he has in another Place.

You then come to set the *Historian* against the *Expositor*, and make him show that the Church did not lie under that *Fatal Necessity*, the Introduction supposes it did ; that there was no want of a Regular Decision of Matters in Synod ; and that our Religion was not *Parliamentary*. If you mean, by a *Parliamentary Religion*, that it was Settled by *Act of Parliament* ; let the *Papists* object it, if they please, 'tis what every One's glad of : If you mean, and they object, That many things were done by the *Secular Power*, and the *Parliament*, before they had gone through the *Convocation* ; 'tis not to be deny'd, with any Countenance, in all the first and Leading Steps towards a *Reformation* ; nor need it, because so easily to be defended, from the *Necessity* of a *Reformation*, and the highest Improbability, not to say more, of carrying it against a *Party*, which,

which, whoever says was not then the major part of the *Clergy*, must know little of that Time. But let's try your Comparison.

You give us the *Bishop's Words* from the 5th and 6th Pages of the *Introduction*; and chop off the words as you think fit, none indeed very material, but some of them as I show'd before, Explanatory.

Here, you say, *Two Things* seem very obvious: 1. That the English Clergy were so govern'd by their Interest that a major part of their Representatives in Convocation could never have been brought to Consent to the Articles, which were prepared in order to a Legal Establishment of the Reformation. The Bishop only says, That they could not have pass'd by the Methods that are more necessary in Regular Times, and therefore they could not be offer'd at first to Synods, or Convocations, and therefore were Prepar'd by some few Men. 2. That for want of that, which could not be expected without a Miracle, the Articles were Publish'd by Regal Authority. An Apology is made, from the Necessity of it, for this way of Proceeding. The Apology is made for their not being offer'd at first to the Convocation. And 'tis plain, from what was done in other respects without them, and from what Dr. Wake says (pag. 599. of his *State of the Church*) that the Archbishop did, in this of the Articles, before they came into the Convocation, He did beseech the Council to prevail with the King, to give Authority to the Bishops to cause their respective Clergy to Subscribe them; that He thought the King's Authority, in those times, sufficient, without the Concurrence of the Convocation; that He had Suspicions that the Articles would not pass the Convocation, at least, not unless they were afraid that, if they did not Agree to them, they would be Enacted by the Regal Authority without them. You go on — Who would not, after this, imagine that our Articles were Comanded to be Subscrib'd to by the Regal Authority only, whether the Clergy lik'd it, or not; and the Articles themselves, framed by the same Regal Authority, and the Clergy in Convocation, had nothing to do, either in the Composing them, or Agreeing to them? That our Articles were fram'd by the Regal Authority, and that the Clergy in Convocation had no hand in framing them, is so notoriously plain, that it need not be prov'd: That they were Publish'd by the Regal Authority, and that that gives them all the Force they have, is as certain: That they were Agreed upon, or to, in Convocation, is plain, from the Title of them; but many that Agreed to them did not like them, nor would (though upon some Considerations, as in other things, they Agreed to them) have fram'd them, as they are, had they regularly began in Convocation, is probable, from what I said before, and from what the major Part of the Clergy prov'd afterwards. That the Bishop knew they Agreed to them, is evident from what you quote out of His History concerning it; but He might not think that that Agreement was any part of the Authority they were Enacted by, seeing some things were Enacted by the Regal Authority, and afterwards requir'd to be Agreed to, in Convocation. All you can lay to the Bishop's Charge, is, not putting into his Account the Agreement of the Convocation. But that, it's plain, he omitted not with any ill Design; because He tells us of that Agreement in His History; because He

He had intimated it before in those words, *first offer'd* ; because 'tis in the *Title* of those *Articles* : And, lastly, because all the *Authority* of them proceeds from the *King's* Enacting them. He thought the *Regularity* of the Proceedings in it was not very material to be mention'd ; seeing 'twas not exactly observ'd, and many other things were Enacted without that *Regularity*. We shall have more occasion to talk of this by and by, and thither I refer what I have more to say of it.

You come now to compare what the *Historian* says to this. If He say any thing contrary to it, in plain terms, it would look hard on the *Bishop's* side : If He say things that seem, or may be wrested another way only, then *Christian Charity* would oblige us to interpret the Places so as to make them agree, and allow a *Bishop* to speak consistently, if we can ; especially considering that He did not think or intend to contradict any thing there said, in the *Introduction*, as we may gather from a *Discourse*, much of the same Nature with this in the *Introduction*, in the *Preface* to the *Second Part* of that *History*, where He appears to have been of the same mind then, that He is now. *The Convocation*, you say, *had a Hand in the Reformation under King Henry*. He was the worst Man you could have pick'd out, One would have thought, for your Purpose ; seeing He so notoriously disregarded all the Regular Methods of Synodical Debates, and Decisions. *What Foundation that Leading Doctrine of the King's Supremacy had from the Acts of Convocation, and how far it was Establish'd by the Famous Act of Submission, is too well known, to need any Proof*. And how that *Act* was forced from them, upon their running into a *Premunire*, in Acting against the *King's Supremacy* before Settled, is as well known. I suppose, by what you say afterwards, that you don't count the *Injunctions* sent by *Cromwell* to the *Bishops* to be any Step towards the *Reformation*, in which there is not the least mention of the *Convocation's* Decisions of them. No more do you those, and the *Homilies* in the Reign of *King Edward* ; but all pass'd the *Convocation*, with you. Indeed, this is downright Whimsy. And in those very Points you bring to prove that the *Convocation* concurr'd with the *Parliament*, or that their Concurrence was thought necessary, (and I believe it had been so, had it been likely to be obtain'd) we shall find some that seem to prove just the contrary.

You give us some words out of the 40th Page, and say, *They show a good Inclination, rather than an Aversion, to what was propos'd*. Those some that intimated this to the *Archbishop* might have a good Inclination, and yet the *major Part* an Aversion to it : Or they might, perhaps, do it only as an Excuse for not Acting, I would say, Debating ; for, it seems, they were not trusted with a *License* till after two Petitions, which looks a little suspicious of them.

The former part of the next Paragraph I will Answer presently : The latter part was only to bring in that Reflection, which you did not consider your own Case when you utter'd ; being it is much more parallel to it, than to that to which you would apply it ; for 'twas the *major Part* of the *Lower House* was on the Side against the *Reformers*. Sure, you could not mean it to prove, what

what you were about, that they had a good Inclination to the Reformation; viz. because the Popish Party was so prevalent in both Houses, that Cranmer had no hopes of doing any thing.

But now to make the *Bishop* not only contradict his *Introduction*, but the very words he had spoken the line before, *That the Popish Party was Prevalent*; you say, that they presented four *Petitions*, that don't at all look favouring of Popery. The 1st. is, *That there might be Persons Impower'd to Reform the Ecclesiastical Laws*. No doubt they felt an Inconvenience of having such a Power lodg'd in the King, as was by that *Act*; whereby He Dispensed with, or Confirmed, *Canons* by His own Power; and besides too, they saw things manag'd by fewer Men than Thirty Two, among whom there were not any that much favour'd Popery. The 2^d. was, *To Sit in Parliament*; or, *That no Acts concerning Matters of Religion might Pass, without the Sight and Assent of the Clergy*. And this one thing satisfies me, that they were not, what you think, inclined to a Reformation: though 'twere no wonder if these *Petitions* were somewhat that way; because Men can, and will dissemble, when they see themselves not trusted with those things, which they would be trusted with, were they sure and steady, and others doing them more thoroughly than they wish them done. But it's a perfect Demonstration against what you said just now in the 78th Page, *That many things were done in Parliament, but not without the Convocation*: and afterwards, *That, since a Convocation was Sitting, with an Archbishop at the Head of them so well inclin'd, it is not at all likely that the House of Commons would have the first Debating of such Points, as is that of the Sacrament, and that of the Communion in both Kinds, without hearing what the Clergy had to say upon such Subjects*. This is *Argument* against *Matter of Fact*. I think the Reason should have stood t'other way: That, since the Commons had the first Debating of those Points, it's a certain sign the *Archbishop*, who was the best Judge, however well inclin'd himself, did not think the House so; otherwise He would have got them a *License* before the Commons had meddled with these things, and have let the *Debates* have been first in the *Convocation*, as they should have been according to *Regularity*; which, it is not to be thought, He would step over, without an apparent Reason. And that the *Matter of Fact* was thus, however unlikely you think it, is evident from the *Petition* it self. For Men use not to *Petition* for that, which they have in their hands; and if, as you say, the Commons did not do those things, without hearing what the Clergy had to say, (that is, the Opinion of the *Convocation*) 'twould have been very idle and ridiculous, for the Clergy to *Petition*, *That nothing might Pass in the House of Commons, without their Sight, and Assent*. And that they had no *License* to *Act*, is likewise clear, because in their *Second Petition* they desire one. Can any One suppose, had the Clergy been well dispos'd, that the *Archbishop* (He that knew them somewhat better than we can pretend, at this distance, who yet will guess, from very *Obscure Minutes*, and from some *Petitions*, which the Circumstances of Things forc'd from them, and which look, at best, but very little that way, that they were of another

another temper than He show'd He thought them) Would the *Archbishop*, I say, have let them be without a *License*? Would He, without any reason, have let the *Commons* break in upon the Regularity of Proceedings in purely Religious Matters? It is Incredible. Things were done as they were, because there was no likelihood yet of doing them as they should be. This will serve for an Answer to the other Two, being much of the same Nature with the First, and the desire of taking off the Six *Articles*. When they procured a *License*, is not certain; but on the 29th of November a Declaration was sent down, &c. as you quote it. This Subscription of the Lower House is antecedent, you say, to the *Act of Parliament*. To its Passing, indeed, it is; but the *Bill of the Sacrament* was Read Four times; and the *Bill for Receiving in both Kinds*, was brought in on November the 24th. which was all before the *Convocation* meddled with it; so that it was first Debated in the *House of Commons*. It's likely, that the *Convocation*, upon seeing that Things would be done in the *House* without them, made their Petitions; which, looking pretty well, gained them a *License*; and then, after they had one, they would not seem utterly excluded, but yielded to some things, by the *Archbishop's* labouring with them, and their own fear that things would have been done otherwise without them. This is a Conjecture indeed, but with some Shew of Probability; as yours is likewise, without any. They Pass'd also that of the Marriage of the Clergy, before its coming into Parliament. You here have gotten an Instance and an half, and from them argue that they had a Hand in all the Steps were made. Whereas, for one such Instance, you cannot but know that you may have twenty produc'd on the other Side, in which Things were done by the *King's* Authority, without Them. But at last, what's all this to prove? Why; There's a Dispute between Some that hate the *Reformation*, and Us: They object to Us, the Irregularity of our Proceedings, that the *Reformation* was carry'd on, as begun, not by the major Part of the *Bishops* and *Clergy*, but by a few selected *Bishops* and *Divines*, who, being supported by the *King's* Authority, did frame things as they pleas'd, &c. Now Dr. Burnet, in his *History*, having found something like this, in his *Preface* Answers, from the Necessity of it; and defends the *King's* Authority: and the *Bishop*, not having yet forgot that He wrote that *History*, and *Preface*, talks much to the same purpose in the *Introduction*. You, on the other hand, for the Honour of the *Reformation*, will have it spotless, and Regular; and, with the Help of Dr. Heylin, prove that all things went on according to the Steps that ought to be Sacred in such Regular Times: They were Pass'd in *Convocation*, and by the Authority of that, and the *King*, Enacted, and Publish'd. This you prove, beyond all Dispute: For, on the 29th of November, after it had been twice sent them, they Agreed to the Declaration about the *Communion*; and on the 17th of December, to the Marriage of the Clergy. And so, no doubt, they had a hand in all other *Acts*, and the *Papists* have not a word to say.

But to go on — You say, That as to what Alterations were made in the Intervals of Parliaments, they were not only transacted by the *Archbishop*, with the
L ready

ready Compliance of the Parochial and Inferiour Clergy; but in most Particulars (it should have been all, or it's nothing to your purpose) were little more (another softening word) than the Consequence (another) of things begun (another) in Convocation. How you are forc'd to mince the Matter? and yet as 'tis with all the alleviating Expressions, 'tis so without reason, so contrary to plain History, that all I can say, is, When Men cannot find, they must make things as they would have them ——— In the Year 1551. the Articles began to be thought of, which required some Time to be digested and argued by Divines; and as 'tis said in the History, Upon these Considerations that Work was delayed by the Archbishop till this Year, in which they set about it, and finish'd it before the Convocation met in next February. Not so finish'd, as to be the Acts of the Church, you say, but brought to such Perfection, as to be laid before the Convocation; as they were the Year following, and Agreed to: As therefore for any Publication of them by the Regal Authority only, before they were thus Regularly Agreed on, or any just Occasion given to apologize for the King's doing any such thing, we have not the least Footsteps of it, &c. The Apology is, for the Articles not being first offer'd to the Convocation, as they should regularly have been; for, as for what is spoken by the Bishop, of the King's Authority, He would have said the same, had they gone regularly through the Convocation. What Thoughts, suppose you, had those of the King's Authority, who would have had the Archbishop begun with the Articles, as you may see in the same Page? Or what Thoughts had the Archbishop of it, and of the Convocation and Clergy, when He would have had the King give Authority to the Bishops to make their Clergy Subscribe them, before they came into Convocation? &c. But we shall see a little farther into this, and into your way of representing Matters. You tell us, out of Fox, what Answer Philpot gave about the Catechism, and the same will serve for the Articles: and so does Dr. A. join them together, and give the same Account of them, and the same Authority to them: They were drawn up by a Grand Committee, &c. And is this the Regular Way of having any Matters pass the Convocation? Is it not Customary, that is, Regular (for Custom is the Rule in the Proceedings of any Body) for the Committee to Report to the House, and the House to Agree to it? And was there any thing in the Catechism, and so, according to you and the Doctor, in the Articles, like this? Did the Catechism ever come into the Convocation? Mr. Philpot talks of no Grand Committee, he plainly means those Commissioners to whose Care the Act of Parliament had trusted the Ecclesiastical Laws: He does not speak one word of a Tacit Acquiescence (which besides, if 'twere to what only a Committee of the Synod did, is not Regular) any farther than as the Act of Submission makes the Clergy give such an one. 'Tis worth while to see how you represent this, and how finely you manage it. This Account answers for the Articles, and for many other things of the like nature. If it do so, then, you'll give me leave to say, That the Bishop might well leave out the Agreement of the Convocation, since the Catechism never had that Agreement, and the Articles are upon the same foot. Nay, the Catechism does not so much as mention the Convocation in its Title. And seeing Mr. Philpot, however

ars
no-
er)
'tis
to
ake
gan
es;
the
wo-
you
were
the
sion
oor-
the
ken
hey
had
with
the
had
em,
into
what
cles:
em,
Com-
mus-
the
the-
ac-
bism
ister,
had
Ac-
did,
give
you
f the
night
had
chism
ilpot,
rever

7